Interview with Dr. Theodore Davidge Lockwood, President of Trinity College, recorded May 5th, 1981.

PK: Mr. President, may I thank you for your gracious cooperation in agreeing to do these interviews. I'm convinced this is going to prove a very important addition to the historical record of the college. I'm delighted that you're willing to participate.

In doing research on you, I find that you were born in the 5th of December 1924 in Hanover, NH and prepared at the Northwood School in Lake Placid, New York, and then entered Trinity in 1942. What attracted you to Trinity at that time?

LOCKWOOD: Well, my main reason for choosing Trinity will sound almost like intercollegiate rivalry. I had only two institutions on my list. One didn't have multiple avocations then--you assumed you'd get into whatever college you chose. Wesleyan was the other one. I visited the Wesleyan campus and the man who showed me around never had the right key, never showed me the right building and generally the impression I had was not very favorable. I came here and a man by the name of Dean Altmyer new exactly how to lead you from Jarvis basement to eventually end up in the chemistry building, getting from each step of the way being better. He had the right number of keys. Dean ~~Jakewith~~ Jaquith, who was dean of freshmen and head of admission, was a most gracious gentleman, and it was the simple matter of I was well received.

I also needed scholarship aid and I got the Trinity scholarship for New York City, having been interviewed, interestingly enough, by

Fred Tanzel, who was obviously a long time friend and aliments of the college, and Harvey Van, and came to Trinity.

The interesting thing was I, from Dan Jesse, had received word that I should come early to practice for football, and as freshmen were then allowed to play on varsity teams, since so many students were going away to join the armed forces, I came up after Labor Day. I think we opened, of course, towards the end of September under the old calendar. My impressions were there wasn't anyone around Trinity because there were only about 25 of us out for football that year and there weren't any other people around the whole campus when I arrived. I found I had a room on the top floor of Jarvis all by myself in one of the old suites, and it was kind of a lonely place at that moment.

Joe Clark was, as so many people discovered, a wonderful, warm individual and Van we all feared. The other strident fact was at 187 pounds I turned out to be the heaviest thing we had on the football team and therefore I was immediately put in the center of the line on defense and tackle on offense, but it was a nice way to get into the college. The college, of course, stopped really on the other side of Cook Dorm. There was Bordman and Jarvis, but not much else on the south end of the campus. So really life was here. I can remember the lower fields were not mowed at that time. We just had the upper quadrangle here and the lower fields were all grass, except for the football field.

I think any freshman who was here when President ~~Oglebee~~ Ogilby was around, recalls the opening session in which Oglebee the raconteur

[unclear]. So he was the kind of person who everyone remembers him leaning out the window and smoking his pipe and so forth.

I was fortunate, I also was the Holland Scholar. We had a competition and took tests when I first arrived and I became the Holland Scholar. I say that was important because all the little things that one later on in life realizes were connections that became very important, and one of them was the visit of Irwin Edmond, a distinguished philosopher from Columbia who came to lecture and Oglebee entered at his house. I was asked to go to the house and meet Edmond, as the Holland Scholar. Edmond later on helped me a great deal during the war when I was trying to push some ideas on peace, how we should reconstruct the world and so forth. It was kind of pretentious, but an interesting exercise.

In any case, it was a series of little connections like that that I think made my freshman year fairly interesting. My only great problem was that I kept losing roommates. I think it would be impossible for anyone, except those who were here in 1940-1942, to realize how--I had a roommate who went into the Navy after the first week. Then I had another roommate who went into the Marine Corps after about the first month or so. I thought it was maybe my violin playing that did it.

Eventually, and this was the other kind of thing that happened that made Trinity quite different from me, again my unusual association, eventually George Cooper, late in the fall went into the services and his apartment on the second floor of Seabury, which was across the hall from Bill Adolf, another member of the history department, he turned over to Bob Hall, who was then a senior and

now a bishop in Virginia, and to me. Bob Hall was 4F, so he wasn't going anywhere so I finally had a roommate who stayed around, and we took it over. I think that is the unusual association. I had gotten to know George Cooper through taking a history course with him. Bill Adolf was also in the course. Humphrey and other faculty members, Costello lived right below us.

So it was the ability to know people in an unusual fashion just as a freshman that I think made an impression on me. You can't replicate that kind of experience later in the history of the college because it was just a strange period with people coming together, but it was an unusual introduction to the college. I was not a fraternity member and therefore I used to eat at Hamlin, which was our only dining hall. I'm sure the food was miserable, but the problem was to get there when there was somebody else there. Otherwise, I would end up with Ed Faber or two or three other people at the most and have dinner because at that time the one thing that I learned and well remember--50% of our students came with their brown bags and went back home again and it made a lot of difference in terms of campus life.

But of course, things were changing. I knew after I came back, after the first semester and started the second semester I knew, as one who had turned 18 by then, that I was going to be drafted or as I decided to volunteer for the Mountain Troops. I just waited until my number was up and beat the draft by a week, and had to leave here in March of '43.

PK: What about the Mountain Troops, that must have been an interesting and unusual assignment?

TL: I think it has had a profound affect on my life, not simply because it was war service, but I remember one time when Dean Pillar, who painted my portrait, came. He knew that I had been in the Mountain Troops for some reason or other, and he said, "Oh, let's put you in a setting against a mountains. This is too important in your life and you've been climbing all over the world since you've come here to Trinity, so we've got to do it against a mountain scene. None of these old portraits such as are hanging in the Faculty Club." I said, "You go see Bishop Gray, he's the one who is commissioning this on behalf of the trustees. If you can convince him, I'm all for it." He came back the next week and said, "No way. Put the old gown back on and we'll get to work." He sensed the importance of the mountains to me, and it was an unusual thing because there were not that many competitive skiers in this country and I and my brother had been one of the pairs of a relatively few number of families that had skied against each other all over the east, as young skiers.

I joined the Mountain Troops because I had served on the Ski Patrol and so on and felt this was the branch I wanted to be in. We were trained out in Colorado and I remember when I arrived, I walked in and the captain of the unit to which I had been assigned was Johnny Litchman, former captain of the Dartmouth Ski Team, who I had skied against and my brother knew very well, and that was what happened. We all had had all this previous experience, so in a sense it was an unusual unit, mostly college people. We were reported to have the highest IQ in the army and the sloppiest in saluting.

But it was tremendous to live in Colorado for over a year in the mountains and climb on weekends. Instead of going into the bars in Denver, we all went climbing. That's how queer we were. But it was an unusual unit. I felt I was fortunate to be a member of that particular unit.

PK: Where did you see service?

TL: Italy. We went into the mountains of Italy and worked our way up. I by then had become the divisional historian and worked out of Informational Education section of Division Headquarters, which gave me an opportunity to go all over the front. I was recording and taking care of G-3 work and so on for the division and therefore once again had the unusual experience of actually knowing what was going on. In those days most people in the army didn't. [laughs] So that was kind of fun.

I was once again fortunate and then was discharged, came back to this country and remember returning to Hartford because the day I arrived on the train for what was to be a furlough before we were shipped to Japan in August of '45. I was struggling to get out to my parent's house in West Hartford when I was announced that Japan was surrendered. So then I went out to Colorado and eventually was demobilized on the 2nd of December in 1945 and came back here. In the meanwhile, I had applied to Trinity to reenter, but had many qualms about it because my father had come to teach in April of '44, I believe.

You might be interested in one record that I'm sure would be lost concerning my father's appointment. It was indicative of Oglebee. The

naval program here--evidently the Navy was becoming increasingly critical of what was available in the way of engineering courses and they threatened in '44 to discontinue the program here at Trinity, which was our lifeblood at that point, and said unless there was a change in leadership in the Engineering Department they would lose it very quickly. Oglebee remembered my father, having met him, and whether he made inquiry or not, he remembered he was an engineer and called him in New York--my father was head of the Engineering School in Manhattan--and said, "Can you come up on Monday and be head of the engineering program at Trinity?" My father said that was a little abrupt and number two, could he come up and talk with him and look over the situation before he gave him an answer. But that was Oglebee, he had made up his mind. He had checked out to whatever degree he did and he had decided this would work.

My father came, and within a relatively short time. That fact made me wonder whether I should return to Trinity. I applied for a transfer to Harvard and was accepted and talked with Bill Adolf and George Cooper who had come back, and then told me, "Don't worry about your father." My father said, "You're not going to be in engineering." I didn't know whether that was more a ruling on his part or a hope, but anyway I finally decided it wouldn't be difficult with my father on campus and came back. So I reentered in January of '46 and to my dismay, Arthur Hughes, who was dean and in charge of assigning the credit for your service against your graduation, said I could receive credit for the full freshman year, which I hadn't quite completed, but I would get no PE credit. I said, "You've got to be

kidding, Arthur. I've been climbing mountains." "I know all that," he said, "but under rules we can't give you any PE credit for it." [laughs]

But the good fortune of it was it drove me into playing squash, learning squash because I wasn't going to go out and climb fences or do setting up exercises for anybody anymore. I went down and I knew Joe Clark and I said, "Joe, maybe I could swim." I always liked to swim. I went down and he let me dive in the pool, watched me and he said, "Dan's looking for squash players." That got me into squash, which I've enjoyed ever since.

Well, I'm rambling.

PK: No, that's quite all right. What were your impressions of Trinity after the war? It must have been somewhat of a different place because there was certainly more activity, more people here.

TL: That's right, it was much different. There must have been close to 800 people here, sort of in mass confusion primarily because there wasn't housing. I was married and therefore had to live off campus anyway, and we were fortunate in finding a place over on Gray Street. It was hard to find housing and I know the college called my parents and asked them if they could take in students. They were really scrambling to find room for people.

We didn't have a large enough faculty. They were bringing in new faculty as rapidly as they could. It was just really a very awkward period. Keith Hunston says that when he gave his inaugural address when he became president, he said that the college would always remain at 800. After he spoke, he laughed and he said, "The registrar called me up and he said, 'Keith, do you realize we're up to 850

already?'" That was our problem. The veterans were entitled and we were just bursting at the seams.

Yet I think clearly as veterans we knew what we wanted and of course to the faculty it was an exciting period. We came through it. We were everything that people said about veterans. I think we were also very conscious in a way that may be fascinating to see it happen again, how far our money would go. The GI Bill was set up in a way that it encouraged acceleration and I know I carried six courses a semester whenever I could, in order to get through earlier and save up enough credit that I could get through graduate school. We all pushed ourselves pretty hard and that was the main business. Most of us didn't get involved in too many other things because we just wanted to make sure we got what we wanted in our undergraduate education. I was determined to become a history major and a philosophy minor.

So we I think had a fairly strange campus in many ways because these were older people and yet things like Medusa and so-forth were still going. There were young people in that you felt like offering them their first razor. That contrast began to build up.

We also had one limitation, mainly that we never knew who was in our class. As you may also realize, Peter, that you didn't have to designate until you graduated what class you were in. That is, I was originally class of '46. I could have remained '46 or I could have been '46W, or I could have been '48. I chose to be considered class of '48 when I graduated. I was pleased at graduation that we had a good speaker. Alan Nevins came to speak. I think that maybe the remarkable part is I can still remember who it was. [laughs]

PK: What led you to pursue history? Had you always been interested in that?

TL: I don't know how to answer that because I guess I enjoyed history. It came easily. I was under the impression that I could write, but George Cooper and others tried to correct that notion or do something about it. I think it was a reaction against doing quantitative things. I had taken all of the other required curriculum. I did perfectly well in physics and things like that, and I was interested in the philosophy behind physics. I guess I just liked ideas and things put in prose more than I did in algebraic equations. I think it's a classic case, also, where there was a good history department. The history faculty kept throwing challenges at me, asking me to do extra papers, giving me bibliographies, having me over. Bill Love took me down to the Institute of Advanced Studies at Princeton one weekend where I met Einstein. I was staying with his parents [unclear].

That's unusual and I think the answer is that when somebody pays that much attention and shares their own interest and fascination, you become bitten. I don't think you can ever underestimate the significance of that kind of faculty attentiveness. I think that probably is why as much as anything else 0I chose history.

That I did well, that they did encourage me, sure, I felt I maybe had found my niche, but I don't have any more profound reason. I think as my subsequent career would suggest, as time went on I was more broadly interested in education as a proposition, rather than just staying in history as a discipline. Like so many historians, I found that

it was excellent preparation, in any case, for a large number of [unclear], but I think I was just impressed with the faculty.

PK: Well, you went on to Princeton to pursue your doctorate. What was graduate education like at that time?

TL: I think it was formidable, and I say that because I was the first one purportedly who had gone from here to Princeton and I remember there was great concern. My great concern when I landed at Princeton and immediately took a four hour comprehensive exam the first day I arrived with only six other students who were in the entering class of graduate school history, and finding out that I was not that splendidly prepared after all. I was well prepared. Trinity had done a great deal for me, but I found that I was not as well read, I was not as broadly educated as the people who were coming from Harvard undergraduate or Duke undergraduate, Swathmore, whatever. I suddenly found that the competition was extreme and pressures were considerable, and it was a new experience because we were a small group of about 25 graduate students in history.

Yet, it was a very accessible faculty at Princeton, a lot of very demanding faculty. I think I had to sort of regear myself that what I thought had been fairly impressive as an undergraduate was not so impressive to them. I would say, and I don't know whether this should be printed for the archives, but I think the thing that I was in retrospect struck by was the lack of enough competition at Trinity for the very good students. I think as an undergraduate there were in each department a small number of good students, and then my impression was there was a considerable gap, at least the competition wasn't

severe enough that we were prepared for the kind of competition that you would encounter in the very best graduate schools., and I was taken aback. But I think the basic education that I had was obviously solid enough that it didn't disconcert me really. It was my first encounter with real intellectual competitiveness. I've always felt that was splendid institution and one of the finest graduate schools that one could attend.

PK: Then you pursued a teaching career for several years. I'm interested to see that you taught at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1955-1960. That must have been an interesting challenge to a educate a view of history a group of men who were really concerned primarily with technology and scientific inquiry.

TL: Yes, and I would make comment about the period in which I entered teaching because it bears certain resemblance to what young faculty are encountering now. Namely, very hard to get a good job and therefore all of us were forced into picking initially assignments that might or might not lead anywhere or were institutions where we would prefer not to remain. I had had a marvelous two years of teaching at Julianna College, but I realized that if I wanted to play a greater role or whatever one says, in education and at that time teaching history, I would have to be better placed. When Lacy Borland Smith left MIT to go to the head of English History at Northwestern, in those days before affirmative action, he just called up and said, "Do you want to take my place?"

So I went up to the Humanities Department. It was a fascinating experience because in many ways the staff that was assembled there,

partly because they paid a little better than most, it was an unusual assignment but it was located in Boston. We had a number of people who were doing exactly what I was doing, namely getting through in the best style possible a difficult period in the academic world until some better assignments emerged, until the economy looked more healthy. Therefore, John Blum, who became Morganthal Professor of History at Yale and Irving Varga--there were a group of people who were really an amazing collection, a certain percentage of whom became college presidents, were assembled there in the field of history, philosophy, literature, music.

I learned more in teaching, how to teach, what was significant because of the fact that the students were required to take the humanities for two years, and then could elect advanced courses. It wasn't a hostile audience, but it was not necessarily the most receptive and many of them were so wound up in the science field that to get them to write, to help them write was a challenge.

Harvey Picker, incidentally, was one of my students.

PK: Is that so? That's interesting.

TL: I think it was one of the most exciting places to teach. It was also an interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary and some of my own convictions about the importance of things like college courses, cross-disciplinary work grew out of that experience at MIT when I felt we wrestled with the educational issues and put into practice things that probably were difficult to get going in a single department or out of a department, but as it was a school of humanities, we all had to get together. There was

no other way to do it. We argued about how to teach [unclear] in very vigorous ways.

PK: What led you into administration?

TL: Chance largely. I had been thinking about it, as to whether I really want to persist in the history and the kind of scholarship I was involved in, namely studies of the socialist left in Europe in the 19th-20th centuries and I found that that was getting to be a rather mammoth piece of research. I had done work on the French socialist movement, but had decided to move over into Belgium socialism because of the coincidence of the socialists also establishing the labor unions and having emerged in part out of and then converted the cooperative movement to political purposes. It was the only country I had found where the three converged, and I thought that was a fascinating kind of pace study and I had studied work on that and presumably still am. It turned out to be much more than I anticipated and I was a little wondering where this scholarship led and how much I would be, very frankly, interested in doing that the rest of my life, particularly as I found myself criticizing the administration at MIT, planning the program at MIT in humanities, always getting involved in the advising of freshmen. I found my interests were getting a little broader than the field of history.

That doesn't quite explain why I was the coach of the Harvard Ski Team, but that was an interesting experience, too. I think at that point I was, whether that consciously or not, wondering whether I ought not to cater to what seemed to be my interest, namely to have something to do with the broader educational and institutional issues.

I had been thinking about this, when during my leave I took and was in Europe working in Belgium on the archives, I received a letter from a friend of mine saying, "Well, you will get a telegram probably when you get to Switzerland, so please call by the American Express Office in Interlocken," because at the end of the summer we were planning to go by. I did and it turned out to be a person with whom I had taught my first year at Dartmouth and he had just been appointed president of Concord College in Athens, West Virginia and was leaving Dartmouth to go down there and wanted to know if I would come down as the Dean of Faculty.

I had so enjoyed working with him and had such an admiration for him that I said, "Oh, well, that should be fun." That got me thinking and I decided therefore to take a crack at it and went down subsequently in '60 to be first associate and then a full dean. I think it was the right decision in the sense that I found I thoroughly enjoyed it, even though that was an interesting, different, struggling institution, but the issues weren't a whole lot different.

PK: And then from there Union College?

TL: Yes, I went from there to Union, once again feeling that I had done as much as I could at Concord College. The assumption that both President Marsh and I had made was that the West Virginia Board of Education really didn't want to make a kind of Harvard College out of Concord College. They wanted a liberal arts college in the state system in West Virginia and they had chosen this one as the one that they would allow to be developed in some fashion. It was clear to me after four years there that it was an uphill battle and they probably

wouldn't commit the resources or commit the change in program that would really create the right atmosphere, so I was looking for an opportunity move if something interesting came along.

I was the 28th person they had interviewed at Union College. They had had such a desperate search for a new dean that they were scrambling. I don't mean this in false modesty, but it was the funniest situation because I went up there to interview for the position and they said, "We're certainly glad that Carter Davidson," who was then president, "has found somebody else because we've gone through 27 people, none of whom we liked." That was my experience with the faculty committee, and I guess I was tired enough from the trip that I said something witty and before I knew it, I was offered the position. I think they had really gotten worn out.

I went up and became dean of the faculty and then found that President Davidson was not too happy. He had been there a number of years and was debating whether to stay and then was offered the position as president of the Association of American Colleges and decided to leave Union about four months after I went there, and the trustees then appointed me provost, rather than acting president, although in a subtle I was.

It was really a magnificent experience when I think back, with respect to Trinity, because I really got involved in everything in a way I had not at Concord, at an institution which is not that dissimilar to Trinity in size and so forth, even though the programs are different. The other happy coincidence was that as we went through a presidential search, the one person that I regarded as the only

reasonable candidate of the three whom we considered seriously was Hal Martin. Hal Martin accepted and became president and of course the connection there is that subsequently he came here.

I guess as I indicated earlier, as you look back as you're forcing me to, you see all these connections and little threads of the way the academic world works.

Calvert Ellis, who was president of Julianna College--my one curious anecdote. I taught five different courses in the fall and taught four different courses in the spring. We had 15 hour teaching loads in '53-54. I was supposed to have two sections of a course in the spring, but I managed to talk them into letting me have one common lecture and teaching only 14 hours instead of 15. Boy, that was an extra hour gained. The president called me in, Calvert said to me, "Since you have a lighter load, would you mind coaching the tennis team?" [laughs] That's how we were worked hard in those days. Calvert was one of those people who never forgot me and I never forgot him. He was the one who told Carter Davidson that he ought to get me as the dean at Union and so forth. People like that, I think as you look back on the academic careers of so many people, [unclear], they really do play a major part in your decisions.

PK: Sometimes, unless you do look back, you're not aware of this pattern.

TL: No, and therefore when you ask why or something like that, I think we all find reasons but sometimes the reasons are as accidental as they are subconscious.

PK: You had been appointed to the board of trustees here at Trinity for a time, had you not?

TL: Yes, as a matter of fact, my connection with Trinity never seemed quite to end. Well, partly because my father began teaching in '44 until he died in the 1960's, I was in the neighborhood, as it were and because the department of history did stay in touch with me at Princeton and there were a number of courses given in summer school, I was asked to come back starting around 1950--it might have been '51--to teach in the summer school.

I don't mean to be unkind, but the department members did not need to teach in the summer and preferred to be in Bar Harbor and such places. Therefore, it was great from my point of view. I needed the money. I needed the experience and it was a grand opportunity to use the summer place over in New Milford, Connecticut and my parents in West Hartford. It was a very nice way to come back and I knew Bert Holland as an undergraduate and a lot of these people I had gotten to know, the married students we played bridge with and keeping those acquaintances along. Playing tennis with Bob Stuart and John Butler and [unclear] and someone like [unclear]. That was unusual because I kept that up until almost 1960, and then as soon as I became dean at Concord, Bert Holland wangled me a slot of the board of fellows and then after three or four years on the board of fellows, the board of fellows asked me to run as alumnus trustee. So I ran as an alumnus trustee and Bert Holland I think found two obscure alumni to run against me, to assure my election. I'm very frank. It was clear there were people who were interested in my getting on the board and so forth, and he was as instrumental as anyone.

I came on the board of trustees in '64 and I would say one thing that may be worth noting. Then board meetings did not last too long. They were very gracious sessions. It was unclear to me that we had to do a great deal. We had typical actions as the executive committee to approve. What we would have done if we didn't, I don't know. We usually had some kind of report to listen to, and not much conversation really or talk about things.

Al Jacobs, as chairman, who presided over the board meetings, as well as being president, had a magnificent facility of saying when a question sort of arouse out of the blue at a trustees meeting, he would say in the most wonderful voice, "That's a very interesting question. We certainly will look into it and now next on the agenda," and I could only admire the manner in which he would keep the meeting going. People like Jack Rattermyer who always tried to get in there, sort of reflected a bit but nothing ever happened. Harold Halden would at the close of the meeting read a newspaper clipping warning us about the infiltration of "reds" into the faculty and there would be a few stage pieces like that, but the meetings were so different than what we were to experience later. [laughs] Once again, it was a way to get to know people on the board.

Then when I was approached in '67 about becoming President of Trinity, which really was in the form of an inquiry from [unclear], and I came over and talked to a few people but did not make a campus visit or any such thing. I was never clear as to how many other candidates were being considered or what the process was. I just knew that they were interested in finding out whether I would accept. Then I was sort

of in a strange position on the board and I would say one of the curious features was that until my election was actually announced, you would have never guessed that the board had ever considered me as a candidate because no one ever said anything.

PK: That's extraordinary, isn't it?

TL: Nothing ever was said in a meeting, no one aside. Nothing was ever said. I mean it was as if it was somebody else by the same name. It was very strange. Then once I was elected and the announcement went out, then I was asked to come to executive committee meetings.

I think, as you probably know from the archives, the other thing was that I was, through an agreement with the union I sort of went on half time with the union, to start working and reading up on what was happening in higher education. A very foresighted thing, which I think was Lyman Brainard's idea that I should have time prior to coming here to gather my thoughts about higher education, and it was during that period that I wrote "The Role of a Liberal Arts College," which was a series of three lectures I gave here, which were not a great success as lectures, I think mainly because the Washington Room was a non inspiring location to try to be eloquent. Quite seriously, when you write something out, which I felt was fairly good prose, it just didn't seem to work as a series of lectures. I think people wanted to know what radical ideas I had or how I was going to transform Trinity and therefore, when I started talking about the wider implications of our global village, Adelaide Stevenson's description, I thought I lost part of my audience.

In any case, I did [unclear] very unfortunate, especially as I also crashed through a tree and was in a cast. My only reason for mentioning that was when I had my official reception here at Trinity -- [end of side 1, tape 1]

TL: There were three things that were prominently on my mind, as I looked forward to coming to Trinity. Number one, it seemed to me that the curriculum here obviously needed changing. That had been apparent when President Jacobs appointed that Curriculum Review Committee in 1967, which was working its way forward. Once I had been named as the next president, that committee got in touch with me immediately and wanted to start getting me involved, getting my ideas, which I did contribute. So I knew the curriculum, and that had always fascinated me because I had changed the curriculum in Concord--had been involved in it, I should say. I had been head of a committee that ended up recommending the faculty union changes, and so I was interested and accustomed to it, but I realized that was a key question.

The second question was quite clearly was whether Trinity, from what I could find out and the information that I accumulated, whether it could afford to remain a men's college any longer. I had said nothing publicly on that, but I really knew that an analysis of what was happening in admissions and financial aid and our stature and so forth was one that was there and had to have quick attention.

I think the third question that was on the mind of any college president, prospective or in office, was the student movement, having begun at Berkeley in '64 and so on. I would say that as a trustee in '68 I was not prepared for April 22nd, and can quite understand as one

who was after all in full time education, why the other trustees and the executive committee on that particular afternoon were so disconcerted and surprised.

I think that's an event that probably I should say a little bit about. I had come down, leg in cast, to attend that executive committee meeting and we gathered here in what is now the president's office, the trustee's room, and began our meeting and then Bill Gwinn had to leave early to go to a meeting at United Aircraft and discovered he couldn't leave. President Jacobs asked the students to please let Mr. Gwinn through because he had a meeting, and they said, "No." We reassembled and really didn't know what was happening. One of the limitations of this room at that time was there was no way either to get out of it--the stairwell was blocked--or to call out of it. Therefore, we didn't really know what was happening for a period of time. We sort of carried on the other business we had on the agenda and when that got through, Hal Dorlett, who was acting dean, was trying to figure out what was going on. Then it became clear through conversations through windows that the students had decided, 168 of them had decided to have this sit-in and to take over the switchboard.

We therefore wanted to know what it was they had in mind, and eventually did have two representatives--I think it was Steve Keeney and Bob Washington came in to explain to us what their demands were, which was for scholarships for minority students. They wanted the college to pledge $45,000 if they came up with 15.

The problem was, of course, that one Al Jacobs had been not well that spring. This, as far as any of us knew, caught him off guard. That is, he did not anticipate anything like this happening.

PK: I gather there was no sense --

TL: No sense of this at all. Roy Heath, who was dean of students, was caught off guard, we subsequently learned, and decided to try to rally a group of other students to dislodge the students who were in here, and they were gathering out here. As we sat there, Harold Dorwitt and Henry Beers I think was as prominent as any trustee. He said, "The last thing we want is a confrontation of students and students," and even though there was some sympathy with Roy Heath's move to try to get some other students involved, it was beginning to be clear that we should deal with this group and not get something else going.

Obviously, another issue was whether we should make any concessions under duress and there was a split opinion on the board, ranging from [unclear] regarded this as kidnapping and he wanted us to call the police and get word to the police and have them all removed forcibly to those like Henry Beers who said, "We better understand what the issues are and help the president come to grips with them some way or another and work our way out of this."

We eventually, after hearing the students, did work out a grounds that we would give careful consideration to them and so forth. Meanwhile, two other things--one of which is very humorous. The question was how we were going to get anything to eat and there being no bathroom facility in there, how were we going to cope with that situation? Dean Dorowitz wife, thinking all along, sent in some food

for us, which the students let through, with empty milk cartons. [laughter] So that took care of that one.

TL: I think the other thing was that it was fairly clear that this really proved very disconcerting to the trustees and it crushed Al Jacobs. He was terribly shaken by it, quite properly regarded it as an affront to the trustees, for which he bore some responsibility in his view, and I think it was just he was not having that easy a spring physically and the thought that this would happen. Here was graduation a little over a month away and all hell is breaking loose. So we were let out of [unclear] and they kept the switchboards until the next day when Columbia took us off the front pages.

PK: I was at Columbia at that time. Of course, I heard nothing about the Trinity situation until I think it was later the next day. I thought, "Oh, my God. Here I am in the middle of one and my alma mater has the same problem." I was really distressed myself.

TL: I think it is difficult when you're trying to recreate these events historically, it's so difficult to recapture the feeling of dismay because now when we look at the demands themselves, we wonder how we got so hung up. But, of course, it was a new experience and I think for the east, which had never experienced Berkeley. We only read about it. We had no notion of what it was to live in that atmosphere or to have activist students of that ilk, and we were just not ready for it.

We didn't know how to handle it and I think for archival purposes, I think we went through it in a fairly good manner and I think people were unnecessarily self-critical subsequently because really there was no physical damage here. There was no bitterness created.

Faculty didn't leave because of it. Some trustees had a little hard time recovering from it, but overall we handled it well.

The thing that happened that I think is important to record is, of course, the [unclear] of documentation on the whole subsequent establishment of a faculty committee and the [unclear]'s role and so forth over what should we do about the guilty party--there were 168. That seemed to become more important almost than the issue whether we were going ahead with the minority scholarships.

It's never been clear to me how that was resolved. There were talks of meetings in the chapel and that sort of thing, and I never knew. I was not here, so I can't comment on it. The thing that began happening as I went back to Schenectady was that the faculty began calling me from Trinity saying, "Hey, this is a very tough situation." Reportedly, Al Jacobs had offered to resign and let me come immediately. The feeling was that that would only confuse everything and quite properly Al was talked out of it.

But the problem that began to develop was that the committee, as you know, spent hours and hours interviewing people and they went through this whole process and came up with a [unclear] arrangement. That the students who were involved should go out and raise some money and do a good deed and that would expunge the affront to the trustees and the--depending on your interpretation--the illegal nature of their act. The trustees, when they got word that it was headed the direction of [unclear], were not prepared to accept that as a reasonable solution.

I remember attending a couple of meetings at the Hartford Steam Boiler in May trying to deal with this, and the faculty getting very worried that if the trustees did something else, then there would be a whole new round of uprising, as it were. Because by then it becomes such an intercollegiate activity that you didn't know what would trigger another display of anger and what politically motivated moves.

The trustees were badly divided because some wanted them expelled, some wanted at least suspended, a few would buy the [unclear] notion, and for the first time in my experience on the board, in visiting in the position of the incoming president, the board was just all over the hall, not knowing how. I think they all felt increasingly discouraged at how you could find a way to bring them together, keep the community from falling apart, recognize the hard work that the faculty and student committee had done. [unclear] had thrown in the towel by then, or I guess they did right after the announcement in May when the committee released its statement that the trustees did not accept it. That then put the burden back on the trustees, and I do not underestimate the role of Henry Beers at that point.

Lyman Brainard was in effect acting as chairman of the board under these circumstances, although he was technically only vice chair, and he and [unclear] who was [unclear] to pacify the situation, but it was Henry Beers who, along with a couple of us, had talked for some time about disciplinary probation and prevailed on the trustees to chose that as the route through, which was in our judgment sufficiently severe to recognize that it was an unacceptable act. By the same token, however, we recognized there were 168 out there and that it was

difficult at that point in the year to suddenly kick 168 out and not expect some interesting consequences, or to forgive them. Also, the question several people asked was maybe they should go out and raise some money anyway and show their good intention, and the development office said, "No way do we want them out there! We'll be in trouble."

So in a sense, the [unclear] was a nice idea but impractical and by this time our inclination seemed like the only way to solve this thing in a fashion that didn't prolong the crisis any longer because by then the faculty had spent hours. The faculty was very tense. I think the students had pretty well gone onto other things, so it was less likely after a month between locking in the trustees [unclear]. I don't think they were going to [unclear], but it was just everyone was tired and taught and somewhat discouraged by it.

I think it was Henry Beers who played the critical role on the board, as I remember it, and he went along with that. The other part of the agreement that sometimes is forgotten is that it was all conditional upon having a commission that summer sit down and reconsider the rules governing the students, particularly, and the manner in which we'd operate in the future because we'd had to create a special committee to hear this case, the case of the students, and [unclear] had suicided itself and we really didn't know what we had in the way of mechanisms to handle any such event in the future. So it was conditional also upon getting this commission established in the summer, which did began during the summer to come up with a set of

procedures which Tom Smith has subsequently revised on a regular basis, but that was the beginning.

I suppose that was a dramatic episode which made my arrival in June--I didn't know and I suppose everybody else was wondering what was going to happen next--under a very strange atmosphere in which to begin.

PK: Were the students prepared to take full responsibility for what they did?

TL: In large part. That summer I also commissioned George Higgins and Roy Heath to analyze the background of all 168 students. It was very interesting because we completed that social evaluation in '67. All the students except the freshmen, the information was retrievable from that study. I wanted to know whether there was any particular pattern that one could see in the kinds of students that were involved.

The conclusion was that it was very much a cross section and that was what disconcerted Al Jacobs, as much as anything, that students that he knew and liked, probably a Si U member or two were involved. It wasn't just a few blacks here and a Steve Keeney or a someone else. There were a lot of them across the board and therefore there was not much one could conclude from that. I think most of the students at that point felt, yes, they were willing to agree that they had done something. They did not agree with the seriousness of it or the nature of it. After all, they were watching what had been going on elsewhere.

I think the group who became the continued spokesmen for seeing that April 22nd not be forgotten and that they do a lot of things

here, that radical group subsequently became a very insubstantial SDS section. They I think discovered on that occasion how easy it was to play politics on campus, that we were very vulnerable to political action if it was at all organized. Basically, we don't think in the terms of counter offensives or we don't think in terms of political reprise or whatever. We don't even have time. We're very poorly prepared for working this way and we obviously operate off the principal that people were presenting things honestly and that if there was a genuine problem, then we'll sit down and talk about it. But people could be playing all sorts of games, that there were a whole series of motivations mixed in with this, that it wasn't just to get minority students in, I think we were slow to catch onto and we don't think that way. We never will and I think I'd rather err on that side anyway, but we were probably slow in picking that up and yet, having gone through that and certainly some of the administrators like Tom Smith, as we then went into subsequent events in '69-70, we became both a lot smarter and anticipatory powers improved considerably.

So it's a watershed time. Obviously, the college had changed in the '60s in ways we had not recognized and which then, as I also look back, it was like coming in when not the college was strong and the college was in good shape, even though the public was all down on colleges because of the rioting and all that sort of thing, more the Columbia's than the Trinity's, but we were all being tarred with that. Particularly, the better the college or the brighter the students, the more likely there were kooks and subversives and everything else.

But basically the college was poised almost to move in new directions. I've often felt that the timing was in a sense gratuitous, excellent for doing a lot of new things. People were prepared for it. It was, you might say overdue. That was true in most colleges in the late '60s. So that then the task, as I saw it as I came in and Al moved out very quickly. He didn't hang around and say, "I'll be here for the next month to help you." I really sat down and said, "What do we tackle first? How do we move, because it's quite clear we're going to do a lot of things rather rapidly." Not just because that's the way a new president sometimes feels, "I'm going to really get in and accomplish all these things," but rather it was quite clear it had to be done and also it was just the right time to do it.

So it was just a matter of putting together the pieces and deciding which to take on. We had a new dean of faculty coming on board, Bob Fuller, and we were just it seemed to me ready to tackle a series of things. It was just a problem of using that summer to think forward to what we could or couldn't do and then obviously cleaning up the residue of the April sit-in. That would take a while.

I think the thing that I concluded during the summer was that there were really four tasks that had to be met pretty quickly, opportunities, whatever. The curriculum was coming along. That was going to be worked out, be presented in the spring of '69. That was pretty well launched. It was just a matter of making sure that we did a few more things that were in the original package and set it up in a way that would sell politically.

Secondly was the decision I made to go coeducational. That meant then that I knew that the [unclear] at least, perhaps not quite up to speed on that one with the board. I remember then talking individually with each board member about that before we [unclear], but that was done fairly rapidly because we announced it in October.

The third thing was really tackling the whole question of student relations, student affairs, and I hadn't really a very good handle on that one but I knew that clearly there was more than just the minority issue, student government. There were a lot of things out there and we better try to get ourselves organized. I think that was the most difficult and elusive. You couldn't do anything one day and take care of very much. It was one of those live with it, work with it. We knew it was out there, whether it was judicial procedures or how HSG--well, the Senate then--how it was operating. What next the radicals would want, so on and so forth, or whether you really have made much difference.

The other issue that was very important that I think no one quite understood, but I had had enough experience at Union in being largely responsible for the budget, that I had spotted it. Namely, we were headed for some really problems. Number one, we had built in a time bomb in financial aid and we were not going to avoid that. [buzzer sounds]

End of Interview

A continuation of the interview with President Lockwood, May 8th, 1981. When we concluded our last session, you had I think completed

PK: When we concluded our last session, you had I think completed an inventory of questions that you had been asking yourself with regard to the college. I thought before we got back to any of those, we'd just go on to pick up two or three other things that interest me, one of which is the travels that you've taken around the world, mountain climbing and other things. What have these experiences perhaps taught you about some of the world problems that we have today and also the value of students going on trips like this.

TL: It's been an unusual experience, as now I look back. I'd long wanted to go to the Himalayas as a mountain climber. I just was intrigued, having read about it so often, to see them first hand, and when it seemed possible to do it in the fall of '71, it became irresistible, even though at the time both my wife and I sort of wondered whether we were so wise after all in going that far into an area where medical problems are acute and conditions are quite different. Therefore, it was with some apprehension that we took that first trip to Nepal and became totally hooked, as it were, on that part of the world.

I think that's the answer to one of your questions. The key to the travels has been that it's just an appreciation of areas of the world that are so different from what we have known in our western civilization and particularly in Europe and this country, the problems facing Asia, the burgeoning population, the different cultural background, the religious heritage which is so much in contrast to ours. In some

respects and I guess in other respects you can say that Hindu religion is not that alien as much of us thought. It's that cultural difference, as well as the long history that region has enjoyed that just make it a fascinating part of the world.

I think from the travels, particularly to Asia, from those travels I guess I've learned to understand more of global issues. I always remember Adelaide Stephenson's term "the global village," and much of my thinking has been modified as a result of those travels, just as it has also by my participation and volunteerism in International Technical Assistance, which you may want to discuss.

PK: Yes, I do want to ask about that.

TL: But I think it is, for me anyway, an ideal vacation because it's so different, and I guess jet travel gets you there so much faster. In a sense I've often regretted that I couldn't go the way Mallory and Irvin and others had to go, namely by boat and you take forever going through the Suez Canal, where the cultural adjustment is really quite slow. Yet, maybe we profit from getting there in 28 hours--it's a long trip--you get sort of paralysis in the rear end--but nonetheless, it gets you from here to there and suddenly the contrast is more striking, perhaps.

I think you just can't escape the fascination of that part of the world and how much we need to understand India, obviously China, in order to appreciate what's happening where most of the people of the world live--Asia. I was thinking of, or example, Africa still has a very small population, not much larger than this country's population, all of Africa, and even though Africa is a contrast, a virgin area that will be

very important to our future, I think Asia is the region that I've come now to appreciate to have much more immediate influence upon our policy. Obviously, we know that theoretically. You read the newspaper and you recognize it, but the travel there suddenly brings it home to you, yes.

I think the other fascination is with a country like Nepal, as we discovered in '71 and on subsequent trips, is it's a beautiful country, very poor and yet the people are so friendly. I think that's the other thing that you wonder if we are as gracious to foreigners as they are to us.

The other thing that's been very important about the travels I think is that they have been a genuine family experience. All the children but one have gone on one or more treks and I think seeing a world like that through their eyes is important, but to them it's also been important, as it is to the students who have gone with me, it's torn away either their arrogance or their provisionalism. It's disappeared in the face of recognizing there's a whole world out there. Not only do they become I think much more tolerant of others and much more perceptive about maybe other people have interesting answers to questions which they're considering.

You asked about the treks on which students have gone and I think those have been fascinating because I'm persuaded not only that the age differential represented by young people and then having older people like myself and others, has given those treks I've led there a kind of unique flavor. We know everybody before we go and we have that advantage, which in '71 we didn't know people until we got there,

and they are eye openers. For me, looking at it as the president, it's given me a chance to get to know some students very well under unusual circumstances and that friendship has persisted. All the students who have gone have almost become another alumni, as they call themselves, the TNT Alumni, [unclear] Nepal Trek Alumni. They do stay in touch and that's created a bond with a group of students that's very substantial and it was kind of fun to know them.

The other trips taken into areas like Africa and the Sahara, to Patagonia, they I think the interest became reinforced by once again the contrast with Asia. I guess it just gives one an appreciation of how much there is out there that one can appreciate, do, see, come to understand at least in part. It's very much of a cliché to say it's a broadening experience, but when all is said and done I think you're life is richer for having done that kind of travel.

The funny thing pertinent to some of our conversation is that I never go out of my way to say, "Oh, here, I'm joining you. I'm the president of Trinity College," and what's kind of fun is to see how long it takes for people to worm it out of you. It's almost a game because I guess you try when you travel and when you go [unclear] like that, it isn't who you are, but rather it's your response to the opportunity to the environment, sometimes to the unpleasantness of the experiences. It's how you respond as an individual, you get to know people on their own terms, as it were, not as a doctor, a banker or a college president. But it is funny, nonetheless how sooner or later somebody finds out. There's no way I can go around Katmandu where I do know some Nepalese, as well as Americans over there. Of course, once they know

who you are, it's your position that becomes important to them and even the hotel clerks, as it were--I've gone to the same hotel three times--and they know who you are by what you do, rather than so much by your individual personality. So it's kind of funny, I'm sure that Trinity College is known in Nepal as a strange and wonderful way.

PK: [unclear] What about the Volunteers for International Technical Assistance. I know you've been interested in that for a long time. Perhaps you could describe that.

TL: Well, I think it may be put into perspective. I guess I've always felt that in our society the voluntary activity of people is very important. I know from my experience elsewhere in the world that the notion that people who have at least some time, means and ability should devote their efforts to voluntary activity of some sort is a notion fairly unusual, say among Africans and Asians. I know from my experience with VITA that as we try to get them to help one another say in Nigeria or Upper Volta, Sri Lanka or some place, like that, that's a notion that takes a great deal of explaining to understand, that it makes sense and it's a good use of talent and energy.

Anyway, I feel that in our country this has been a very important way in which we take care of or bring along efforts on behalf of those either less fortunate. Obviously, for cultural reasons you have volunteers who serve on symphony boards and museum boards and all that sort of thing, help out and so forth. I guess this has been my major voluntary effort over the years, ever since I've joined the board of what then was called International Technical Assistance. Now it's just called Volunteers in Technical Assistance. I joined it when I was at Union in

1965 and I find now that except for one other member of the board, I'm the oldest in terms of service. It was and is a fascinating effort started by a group of engineers who were concerned that the gap between have and have not nations was growing rather than closing, as technology improved. That we had not found a way, except by just giving money, to help people in other developing nations, particularly, who did not have the benefits of western technology, who had not been able to solve some elementary problems.

Agriculture, health, small business and so forth. They were trying to find out how could we do it in a way that was not contaminated as much by the political factor, offsetting Russia or something like that. Therefore, it was done as a private, voluntary effort of people who had the knowledge to transfer to transfer that in a congenial fashion to people who have an expressed need. I think one of the great problems in the world and something I've been very conscious of is so sort of like tapping the chicken or the egg before the chicken is raised or the egg is born--you go over and try to solve somebody's need before they recognize it, and fail.

Therefore, VITA piggy-backed very quickly on the Peace Corps and became technical backup, but in terms of my own involvement, I was brought in as the only person who didn't have any technical background worth transporting anywhere. I was to help with the fund-raising and the organization and structure and management of it. We had some very, very rough years when I was chairman for about three or four years, trying both to get people to help us on the board. Jim Kettering and others, [unclear], people who shared our concern and to

get their support and philanthropy behind the organization. We had a long hard struggle in those days, even though we became the technical backup for the Peace Corps, had a good track record. But still we were fumbling around trying to find the mechanism through which to do it because we were a small organization and we couldn't go flying around the world helping people, and had to essentially do it by response to their requests for help.

Yet, persistence does pay off. I suppose now we are the best known and maybe the most successful of the many voluntary organizations that have gotten into this particular approach over the years. [unclear] Technology Group in England is one now that largely works with us and we have taken over much of their work. We work with various agencies in the United Nations. We now are the primary group to which the AID works, and we have helped the World Bank on the various projects they have, and we've had support from the Rockefeller and Stone and a number of other foundations.

It's still a modest effort. I guess now it's a major involvement to gain appropriate--well, energy, small scale energy has become a very major focus. From the point of view of what we're talking about and my own interest, it has been and remained a central interest of mine. I think in a funny way it has brought Trinity to the attention of a lot of people, both in this country and abroad, that might otherwise never have known about the college. So it's a kind of strange consequence in that way.

But it's just a fascinating attempt to help. I think there may be a couple other observations I can make. I think that it appeals to people

who are primarily thinking of service organizations, even though there are people from corporations and so on. But it's a natural extension of what we try to do in education and I suppose that's one of the reasons it appeals to me, as opposed to some other efforts I could spend energy on.

I guess the second thing is that it so obviously ties on with my travels. Once again, they have reinforced one another and needless to say, when I've gone on travels I have in some instances tried to visit and find out about what VITA was doing well or not well. I hoped that it would be something --

[end of side 2, tape 1]

PK: --interview with President Lockwood, May 8th, 1981. Cassette 2, Side A. Won't you continue please with VITA.

TL: Well, I think the other point that I wanted to make was that obviously VITA and my travels abroad have heightened my own awareness of how small the world the is, how important it is, and here I think it does apply to my own interest and concern with programs at Trinity, how important it is that we understand Asia, Africa, in particular, where so much is happening so rapidly, even though the technological gap is extensive. I would only use this illustration: the Cameroons we need to help with cesspools, but they are using satellites for radio communication.

So the contrast--it's this adaptation is so immense that we have to appreciate it. I feel that in a sense, fortunately, both from my travel and my association with VITA that I have some vague notion of what all may be entailed in the process.

I would mention one other thing, pertinent to Trinity. When I was thinking about this some years ago and there was interest in the Department of Religion in particular with the Third World, I then took the initiative in establishing the Trinity [unclear] Program Fellowship, and although we have had relatively few candidates, or students with sufficient self-confidence to go to these parts of the world, I have used VITA and my knowledge of peoples over in Africa and Asia to provide some liaison for the few students who have been appointed [unclear] Fellows. I think it's just a small thing for Trinity, not known to most of the people out in the Quad, and yet for those few who are aware of it, probably a unique experience. It's the kind of thing that I would hope--when you talk to people like Bert Gassman and others, that we can do little things. That's why I was interested this year when the World Affairs Student Committee got going and started a series of lectures. I guess my bias is fairly obvious, but it is part of the product of VITA.

PK: Let's move onto looking at Trinity as an institution of higher education in this country. How would you assess it today as a liberal arts institution? Place it within its group of peers nationally.

TL: Let me flip that a little bit and get at that question a little differently which maybe has the advantage of being chronological. When I came to Trinity, I knew from my links with the college and from experience at Union that some of the very best liberal arts colleges in this country still had a sort of second-class or a second-grade or a second-level mentality. I had certainly encountered it at union. I became aware when I got here that despite our good, and I think much stronger position in the community of colleges in 1968, that still many faculty,

trustees and others, maybe especially alumni, felt, "Well, we didn't have as much money as Amherst or Williams." We were somehow not quite as good as say a dozen of the leading liberal arts college. That became reinforced when we had a feasibility study done by Harry Lockoff for our capital campaign, which we started the campaign for Trinity [unclear], and it does bear on your question because he came back with amply evidence where he said that, "The college is obviously able to undertake the campaign. The college is obviously well regarded, but it's god an inferiority complex that is out there all over the place." That just reinforced my own judgment as to Trinity's position was that we were far better than we believed ourselves to be.

It's not an uncharacteristic attitude or reaction among the smaller colleges. Part of that comes from the tremendous growth that occurred in the '60s which created mammoth state systems with great funding from legislatures. The Ivy Leagues have always been out there and no matter how much we called ourselves the "Potted Ivy League," still we were smaller, less well known, etc., etc. That kind of inferiority complex was something I was determined to attack, and I now come more to your question.

I don't know whether we've eradicated that, but I would regard it as one of the things that I have attacked, as it were, over my presidency because I think ultimately it's a very important thing. You don't' go out in the Quadrangle and say, "This is a high priority." Nobody would understand it. You just hope by a series of acts to get at that. Now, explicitly I would say that Trinity is regarded outside and gives evidence inside of being one of a small collection of distinguished

liberal arts colleges. There just aren't that many. When you start looking around the countryside, however you measure it, there are not that many that would be in our rank. Now, where we rank within that cluster of colleges I don't know, and I'm not sure it's important. Maybe in one respect we'd be at the top of the list, say financial management. Everybody has envied us our ability to get through difficult periods with far less, at least visible, distress than others. But maybe our students have lower SAT's than others that enter other colleges, and that's true. How all this balances out, I don't know, but we certainly are in a cluster at the very top and I think it is in a sense misleading to say, "Well, but we're not Harvard." That's of course, a standard faculty--

PK: Of course we're not.

TL: We're not Harvard and --

PK: That's our function. I think that's pretty clear.

TL: That's right, but I think at times you can talk yourself into that position and then you say, "Well, Trinity just isn't' that good." That I think is not only a fruitless thing, but it's to misperceive what our function is, as you suggested. Therefore, I think Trinity is right up there at the top among a small cluster of institutions to which all over small colleges look in this country. I would say we are both internally and externally we have come a fair distance. Whether we've come all the way--I would hope to get rid of whatever inferiority complex we had, others will assess that, perhaps. But I think we've come a distance and I think that's an important factor in not only our self-image, which isn't

probably the term, but also in what has happened nationally in higher education.

I would point to three things that occurred that were very important. Certainly, the invitation to join the Consortium on Financing Higher Education. When the original eight institutions involved in this known study decided they would expand the number and extend the participation of studies and lobbying and so forth that that consortium has undertaken, Trinity was in that first group who were invited when they decided to reach out and get the rest of the Ivy League involved, with Stamford, Northwestern, Chicago and Duke. We are one of the 30 institutions in that consortia, which really does have the very top of universities and colleges, independently. We do represent something atrocious like 75% of all the endowed moneys in private higher education are represented in these 30 institutions.

We were invited, not knocking on the door, and we have played a good role, an important role in that cluster. I think that was recognition from the outside, to me very important, that we be involved.

Secondly, I would feel that my work with the Association of American Colleges--this will sound bad--I think I was persuaded that Trinity had, for reasons that may have been very good, inactive in national circles. We needed to play a role. It was partly in my view to get the name out into circles that could help us. I felt also that we probably had as an institution about as much intelligence as one could rally when it came to issues before higher education.

So I felt it was proper to get involved in the Association of American Colleges and I was pleased when I was asked to become the chairman of the association. I was on the board perhaps longer than anyone else in its history. Because it brought Trinity out there. People got to know Trinity and that I think was important for the college. So similarly when I agreed to serve on the American Council on Education. Interestingly enough, when that council formed three years ago, the Business Higher Education Quorum, as it's called, in an attempt to bring the corporate leaders of major companies in this country together with the presidents of major institutions,. A very small group was formed with fifteen companies, now eighteen, and college presidents. Jack Pellison at ACU asked me to be one of the founders, along with Bill Bowan from Princeton. I think it illustrates what we needed to do as an institution, which I think you can't underestimate. Trinity is involved and I agreed to serve on that business forum with the presidents of Ford and General Motors and Pfizer and so-forth.

Once again, I think that we are known and recognized and evidently well regarded as an institution is very important. I guess I'll go back to where I started when I answered this question. We had obviously become a national institution after the Second World War, and yet it's true of any institution, except for the very largest and most prestigious universities, every college is somewhat regional in both its student population necessarily and its immediate influence. But it seemed to me that we had to break away from feeling too regional and I think nationally, if I can put it that way, even though we're not going

to have any influence in Arizona and we're not going to get many students from Arizona, still you have to think nationally and recognize that it is a national institution.

That's a long way to answer your question, but I think it's an important factor in trying to place Trinity within the colleges and universities.

PK: How does that translate into attracting students? It's been of great significance in our profile.

TL: I think it has had the consequence of making Trinity a better-known institution, which therefore, whether it's so much in even high schools or prep schools, may be less important that a parent in Denver can say, "Well, my daughter is at Trinity," and there's likelihood at the dinner table that others have heard of us and they don't have to say, "Which Trinity?" or "Where in heaven's name is Trinity?" I guess that keeps occurring more frequently now. It's that subtle in which it occurs that may be most important, and I think the college is well-known. I only half believe parents when they say, "My goodness, Trinity is the most popular college to get into the United States, virtually." They have a bias as parents, but still their enthusiasm or even their exaggeration is an important index of what we're talking about because these are people from places outside of Connecticut and maybe Philadelphia where we have that built in constituency, but it's as likely to occur with somebody in Virginia and California or Denver.

It does translate into--we can build on it, I guess, to answer your question about attracting students. We can build on it much more successfully now. We don't have to go out and explain the whole

proposition from the very beginning. Really, our challenge is to take advantage of it.

PK: And it is a continuing effort.

TL: Right, and you can't lapse. I think what happens is a lot of it's mythology, obviously. It bears little relation to fact, but when an institution--I say this with great affection for Wesleyan, but when an institution like Wesleyan through 68-70 and so forth, the scars lasted long after. Similarly, an institution which sort of loses a few years and is sort of treading water and doesn't keep moving ahead, pretty soon people will say, "Oh, yes, I remember that institution. What's happened of late?" You can never afford to relax. You have to keep working at it and moving it.

As I was telling you earlier about my involvement with Prince Charles now, I think that just ripples out and people like Arm and Hammer suddenly know about it in a way that they didn't, and you just don't know whether that's going to pay off. You know whatever it is, you've got to keep doing it whenever you get a chance. It's one of the things it seems to me that extends a college president to the nth degree, that you can never relax that effort, and when the opportunity comes up, you hop on a plane or whatever it is and you do it. I suppose that's what wears some of us down fairly severely over time, you wish you didn't know you had to do it because then you could maybe read something for a change.

Colleges have changed so much since the time I was a boy growing up in Hanover and knew something about Dartmouth. It has changed and I think with corporate executives, so college presidents

have almost been trapped by this kind of problem of always trying to extend the knowledge of the institution and in ways that we didn't feel were necessary when there were relatively few students and there were relatively few institutions.

So as an aside, I think it has transformed the college president's job to a considerable degree.

PK: What about the future of Trinity? Do you see this as a bright prospect?

TL: Well, as you know, of course, I think we're in a very strong position. This is going to be a difficult decade. Oh, well, my own response to that is that if you cannot conceive of say a president's role as being one in which you assess what are the challenges and where are the opportunities and you go about it--that's the fascination of the job, after all, to respond to challenges, whether they're managerial or educational or whatever. I think clearly we're in a strong position, as strong as any institution I would suspect, to adjust to whatever the '80s presents. That's the kicker in your question, is that we don't know quite what's going to happen. We know now that because of demography and changes in financial aid, it will be more difficult perhaps to maintain the kind of student body you wish. That is, attract them, support them. I'm convinced we will have to come at that whole issue differently than we ever have.

I think the intellectual disarray in higher education is sufficiently severe and has been for sometime that we're going to have to, as faculty, work at that one and that will take a decade or two to recapture a real consensus as to what we're doing, should do and what disciplines should be represented and so forth. That's a much slower thing. I

think we're in fairly good position to come to grips with that. It is more difficult in our dimension than in the larger university where it may have greater flexibility, if you chose to exercise it.

I think the central question before Trinity in the future and will bear on the answer to your question, is do we make incremental adjustments to both the known and unknown challenges coming up or if we shake the crystal ball hard enough and long enough, do we see that the necessity of a fairly fundamental change in the kind of educational services we'll provide? Now, I use such attractive term as "educational service" for the simple reason that I'm persuaded that in this country we are going to have to change the manner in which we make secondary educational available to the American population. We've done lots of things and created the community college, which now accommodates 40% of all the people in post secondary education. That's a mammoth development. It's not working in every instance as well as people had hoped, but there are a whole series of other educational needs out there that the traditional institution, and in a sense we are traditional no matter what we say, the traditional institution has but a vague notion of how to address. I guess I am uneasy on that score. I do now know whether we will have to try to-- back up and put it this way. We need a process through which we can assess whether that substantial a change is necessary as opposed to the incremental approach. That's what I see my successor basically doing, sorting that one out. My own conversations during the spring semester when we began the search for a new president is no one understands any the question that I proposed about the future, and I suggested that's

central when they're looking for the next person to have some notion. I'm probably being either premature or difficult, but still that's what lies ahead.

I think we have the resources and the reserves to face it, but when you ask about the future of Trinity, I think there is no doubt in my mind as you look over the history of institutions, you can see when an institution is floundering. Let me cite Union, which was the largest university in the United States and the best known in 1845, larger than Harvard, but it had such a dependency upon the sub constituency it had that when the Civil War came, it almost went under, but in the same time other institutions didn't suffer. It never saw that coming, that it should have a backup or be in a slightly different posture, and I think that's the kind of thing you don't necessarily foresee and there were some colleges during the Second World War that just took such a beating it took a long time for them to recover. It's not out of the realm of possibility that many less distinguished institutions could have a setback over the next ten to twenty years.

I think Trinity is not vulnerable to that necessarily, but within the whole realm of higher education we could emerge in ten or twenty years either very much secure in our present position or somewhat shaken by it.

PK: I suppose it is a question, too, of dealing with the future in an active rather than a passive tense. You've got to engage it, not just let it come in.

TL: You can't be reactive or you will end up on whatever scale, lower than higher.

PK: Yes. How would you assess your years as president here at Trinity in terms of some of the major accomplishments that occurred? Coeducation for example and things like that.

TL: I was afraid you were going to ask a question like that because it always get to be a little embarrassing or indelicate or whatever way you look at it, it somehow is unbecoming to make a comment on that. Yet I would try to be objective about this, and let me, lest I forget, put down what I would see as major changes. Certainly coeducation has been the most dramatic. Time will tell whether it is as important as some other things.

The new curriculum, the move to an open curriculum has been important certainly. Some of the consequences of that would be very positive, others I'm very worried about.

The enlargement of the college, which was an unglamorous thing in a sense, I think was important. We were at a size that would not have been manageable or we would have had a greater struggle over the past decade had we not expanded because our facilities and everything else were underutilized. So for a lot of practical reasons I think it was essential, but nobody recognizes necessarily--growth can be both bad and good. I think some places over grew. We I think did it at the right time and we stopped at the right time.

PK: It was a natural process, too.

TL: It was a very natural process. Obviously, dovetailed very nicely with the coeducation. It seems to me that the thing that people find rather unengagingly comment on, they say, "Well, we certainly like the way you managed the finances. You put us in the black and you kept us in

the black. That management, that has been just spectacular. Nobody else did it so well," or something like that. That I think has been [unclear]. I see it in a different way or appraise it in a different way.

I think what we have learned to do--colleges and universities were very slow to learn--is to understand our economic situation, the financial constraints, how you allocate resources. The whole vocabulary we didn't even know. We just kind of went from year to year in most colleges and universities and despite warnings in the early '60s from people like Sidney Tipton and others, "You can't work that way indefinitely," and the great sophistication of the state system to attack obviously develop instruments of financial management for New York State and so forth, and Trinity didn't know anything about it but we had never had to.

We had to become very sophisticated in a hurry and I guess how that's I can see it and I think that's been a major accomplishment, and that I can put in those terms because it obviously didn't involve me alone, but involved others like Bob [unclear] getting to know what it is that we're doing when we're budgeting and project and so on and so forth, and becoming more precise about our financial needs and so forth.

That, obviously in that regard, was the success of our capital campaign, between the [unclear], that was the important thing.

I would list a couple other things that probably would be missed because people don't know about them necessarily. One would be the change in which the way the Board of Trustees operates. I think that has been an important task for the last decade. We were in a very

fragile position when I became president, in my judgment. It's only one person's judgment. We could not live with the kind of non-changing board. We had to change the structure of the board, had to achieve more turnover and we had to function differently. We had to bring the board up to speed to the changing life around us and the changing years of the college, and we had to find a process whereby we could bring on and take off people more regularly than we had. We passed a new charter and so forth, restructuring at the base level. We haven't finished that task yet.

That's something nobody pays much attention to out on the Quad once again.

PK: It's not visible.

TL: It's not visible, but if this college hadn't undertaken that we would have gotten in a very crusty and difficult position as an institution. So in some respects that job--I can look back and say, "I wish I'd done this, that or the other thing about it," but I think we made substantial progress, thanks largely to the trustees themselves. We made a lot of progress, but it was absolutely essential and nothing glamorous about it either, but that I would say is not well understood. It was critical to the future of this institution.

In something of the same respect it seems to me that our way of approaching staff--and I'm speaking of both staff and administrators--had to change. We had some anomalies. We had some problems there that we had to find better ways of dealing with. We were propelled in some sense by the changes in American society coming in, affirmative action and so on. The ball game was changing at the same time we

were trying to cope with our own local limitations, as it were. So it's all come along in a kind of tumbly way this last decade, but I think recognizing our needs among the faculty and administrators was critical and hacking and sorting out our staffing needs and reallocating manpower and all those unglamorous things, that was and remains an important--whether it's an accomplishment or issue--important to face now. To do something about and straighten out and get the procedures in better shape.

I have always maintained that colleges have been notorious in riding on the loyalty and dedication of their staff. It was maybe necessary and nobody complained, but I think you can overdo it and we were I thought getting very close to relying on that too conspicuously and we needed to address both our strengths and weaknesses and establish the processes by which we could make the changes and face the staffing problems we had.

That's once again something I suppose that because we didn't have a--well, we had some isolated flurries about it, but the fact that we didn't come unglued or suddenly have massive resignations or whatever, therefore you don't see it as a major issue, but that was our most central problem here. I feel that we've gotten through it in good shape.

I would add one other very vague comment to that. I suppose any president, that president's style becomes an important factor in how an institution responds during a given number of years. Certainly I recognize now more clearly than I probably did when I came--certainly I didn't quite understand my own style that well when I came here.

What now I realize is that one of the things that has happened is that we have tried to anticipate and kind of work our way through in undramatic fashion a series of issues as they've risen.

My style, I suppose I have never enjoyed the frontal assaults or I never felt it was a politically astute method to let something boil over and then gleefully go in with a solution and mop up after everything has gotten pretty hot. There is much to be said for that approach. It's not one I like. It's not one with which I can operate easily. I didn't have that talent to handle it and therefore I much preferred to, as we saw things coming, to kind of muddle our way through and keep people in sullen discontent rather than in open rebellion.

PK: There's a subtle difference, but --

TL: Yes, there's a very real difference in how you go about it. I think of particularly somebody like Tom Smith who is a past master at that technique and I suppose that's why we both find it very congenial and that's why we operate as we do. But it is. I think we've tend to anticipate most of the key issues in time. We may fumble them along a little bit and not find quite the crisp solution that we all wanted, but probably that's something that has been characteristic of the institution during my presidency. Some people say, "How brilliant that is that you got to that issue before it boiled over." I'm not sure about how brilliant it was, but I would much rather try to get in and handle it before it got to a form where--

PK: It couldn't be.

TL: Well, but others could argue that if you let it come to a real head, let [unclear] knocks heads and you go in and say, "This is the solution."

That that may be a more effective method. Anyway, we kind of worried things along, tried to keep them contained and the result is that sometimes the solutions aren't as clear as the proclamation after the battle.

I say that because issues like developing an individualized degree program, on which faculty had very strong feelings pro and con, that kind of got froze up and compromised. Then it's come along and I think it's been a pretty strong and hardy plan, which I have had great interest in. We might have gotten it launched more vigorously had we had a real showdown battle over it, but my own judgment was that I wasn't that confident that the whole thing might be scrapped. If we faced that to a showdown, we might get the wrong vote. So you kind of work it ahead and kind of falter a bit. I knew perfectly well what I wanted to see happen, but I used a style that was a little I guess some would say a little confusing or unclear. Well, it wasn't unclear to me, it was just a choice of tactics that I felt was essential to the outcome.

I mention this because I suppose if you look over the last 13-14 years, that might emerge as a very self-conscious way in which the administration was operating and it is a contrast in style.

PK: Do you feel that your position as an alumnus at the college has helped you carry out some of the things that you felt were necessary in terms of garnering alumni support? Has that been a blessing or a curse to you?

TL: Let me work my way out to the fringe on that one. I think my being an alumnus, my having had connections with the college almost uninterruptedly has been a great help. I've just known so many faculty

that however annoyed they might be on a given moment at something coming out of this office, I could still meet them on the walk and remember which games that I played--or whatever it was. That has made a lot of difference, I think, in working things along. In retrospect you could say I should have used it more effectively, maybe, but be that as it may, that was important.

I think I knew some alumni. My feeling about knowing alumni and being an alumnus was how's that going to help? I think the answer is a ambivalent. I think when an alumnus becomes president, a lot of alumni in a very superficial way respond by saying, "Oh, boy, Joe will certainly take care of me. It's great to have an alumnus instead of one of those management experts or someone who all they've known is Harvard. He knows the college and he'll do the right thing." Then the first thing you do they don't agree with, they say, "My God, he should have known better." They flip to the other extreme. Whereas, if I hadn't been an alumnus they'd say, "Well, he just probably doesn't understand the college that well yet."

But I was supposed to have understood everything as an alumnus and therefore coeducation being a great example, although the alumni were really very unresponsive on that issue. There were a few that were upset and a few were enthusiastic, but the fact that most of them didn't really care that much one way or another was astonishing. Yet, when they react to things, they are apt to flip one side or another more vehemently than if I were not an alumni. I discovered that out [unclear] sort of a favor.

The one that really cut me was when one alumnus wrote and said, "I knew your father very well and as an alumnus and as a son of Harold Lockwood, you should have known better." So you really get whipped on that one. So I guess that's the privilege one feels when it's an alumnus.

But I think on the other hand it's given me a great advantage when I go out. I think in my irreverent remarks to alumni groups that I can sort of say something that ties back, "You remember..." It's given me a tremendous advantage in that regard because if there's a faculty member that they ask about, like "How about George Cooper?" I know. Whereas, a person without that background will not know those people. There's hardly no one around we now knows as many of those people as I do. So that's been a tremendous advantage to me. I wouldn't underestimate it.

PK: What about the role of the college president? You mentioned earlier that we've undergone dramatic change, certainly not in the last --

TL: Qualifications, requirements [unclear] in order to be a college president. I tend to be flip on my answer to that. It's interesting because people do ask and particularly when the trustees on the Search Committee decided they wanted a definition of responsibilities, I asked, "Do you want the short version or the long version?" The short version, you have to be everybody and you have to be everything, you have to do everything. And it's preferable if you play tennis or golf very well, too.

It's the same absurdity, however, you would find in any chief executive officer, the President of the United States. Any of these jobs today I think your definition is absurd. You want all these qualities.

I do feel, though, that there are certain key elements in any description. I mention one, patience. I'm not sure that I haven't been too patient. Some people would say that it's good to have a little--you should react a little more impatiently at times than maybe I have, but you've got to have patience because you're dealing with a very different constituency than a corporate executive. You've got every kind of possible constituent out there.

I think you therefore have to have a high sense of diplomacy, as I would call it. Maybe I could elevate it to the level of statesmanship. You know you've got to be able to respond to, react to individuals from their perspective and you've got to understand those positions from which they're coming. Perhaps even more so than in almost any other job there is today because you're going to have to explain, explain and explain whatever has happened at the college or why you need the money or whatever it is. Therefore, I think the president has to understand what is in other people's minds. That's important. Internally it's critical. If you don't appreciate the worries of faculty or of staff, you will inevitably lose some support or you will miss opportunities or you will do things that are misconceived and ill-timed.

I would say that the thing that --

[end of side 1, tape 2]

TL: That's also another way of saying how the presidency is changing. You just [unclear]. You are called on upon to do so much more than I think

earlier presidents were. That's one again the change in what has happened to all executives in part. To just illustrate, certainly the current president at Trinity cannot be uninvolved with the community. You face many demands from the community to which you have to respond in ways that probably the time table was slower in the past. The principal was there, but the time table or the numbers of demands were fewer.

I think you are expected to address more issues on campus than perhaps would have been characteristic. The president has to be accessible in ways that necessarily didn't pertain earlier. That isn't to say that some presidents, somebody like Oglebee, were accessible in the sense they liked to be, but the reason he could be was that the volume of stuff of on the desk wasn't comparable to anything like what we have today. Whether it's government or research you conduct, it's much more time consuming. Some of this is just a predicament of modern bureaucracy, I suppose, but also I think it's compounded by the fact that as non-profit institutions, colleges have not been able to add the staff to accommodate the changes. We work basically with the same size staff and everyone gets stretched a little farther and the only way you can adjust to that is to be damned efficient about what you do.

I say that because I think unless--I may be totally wrong here--unless you can delegate a lot more than I found I could or wish to, a slow worker just wouldn't be able to do the job. That is, you have to be able to write whatever it is all the way from a memorial service to major addresses to annual reports to a lot of little things all the way through. You have to be able to do that. I think in a smaller college

especially, if you delegate a great deal of that away, everybody gets to know it and they really don't feel that you're expressing your own thoughts. There is in short a constant irony of people wanting you to settle everything, including the size of plastic bags, to complaining when you do. [laughs]

But in a small college that is a fact. If you're head of the University of Michigan, everybody knows that you don't know anything about the institution. You're just managing a group of deans. You're running a major corporation and therefore you don't really know what's happening in the classroom. In a small college you're always caught in the crossfire, that you're supposed to know exactly what is happening or when a post gets knocked down that you notify B & G. Therefore, you're playing an impossible game in that sense, but for myself it is I suppose as others around the administration will be the first to underscore, it would be nice if you didn't know as much about the place or if you didn't get into these things. It tends to muck it up a bit. Yes, I know more than I probably should know because I kind of like to know that budget inside out and I want to. If I decide the trash cans are in the wrong place, I guess I am the sort of person will therefore write a note.

But you've got to be able to do these things fairly quickly, I guess I'm saying, or otherwise you will just be buried. I guess that's a funny way to answer it.

PK: It gets to be a wheel of carborundum, doesn't it? As you were saying earlier, you just feel ground right against this continuum.

TL: You get the phone call from the trustee who wants to know why somebody didn't get accepted, as if I have the admissions folders for 90,000 candidates right in front of me.

PK: Of course, and were making the decision yourself.

TL: Yes, but I can't say, "Well, I'll have to Howie call you," because I'm going to have to get back to that person, after I get the information. I'm going to have to be familiar with the case, and I think that is the difficulty in the smaller college. It's that you are always expected to have that individual touch. Well, after all, we say to students, "We provide attention to the individual." Well, there's a kind of wonderful way in which that rubs off throughout and you do, quite literally you have to pay individual attention and it may be costly in terms of organization of time and money. There's a price.

PK: Do you think there's any natural time limit within which a presidency should be carried out? Is there such a thing as staying much too long in the position?

TL: Oh, yes. Nobody's going to beat [unclear] who was president of Union when Lincoln was born and was still president when Lincoln was shot. We don't have to worry about that one, but that was the classic case of overstaying. He rose and fell under the same president.

The myth is once again that ten years is somehow, like the curriculum, the normal life of a president, the normal life of curriculum. I don't know why we got into ten years. It should have been seven since we talked about sabbatical and so forth. I think just about when that was becoming established, then people started keeping statistics on the turnover and of course nobody was making it to ten years,

particularly in the 60s and early 70s. I don't know whether that is reasonable or not.

I think it is intimately tied to what happens in an institution and what happens to the particular president in that institution. In short, I think as long as you have enough political chips left, as long as you are able to move the institution and are enjoying the job, then I think there isn't a specified time. But there will become a point when either--I've seen this with some of my colleagues--they obviously had ceased to enjoy the job. Then that's bad because they'll get to feel like martyrs and that's the one thing I think you can never feel as a president.

That would be one point at which the president ought to get out. The other point is which I feel I have reached the point where the kind of leadership, the kinds of issues I've been able to resolve and the leadership I have brought has kind of run a natural course. I think it's reached a point where even though I would be so arrogant as to say I probably have a better understanding of higher education than most people in the country and I could foresee what we should do and could recommend lots of changes, and I don't think I lack a vision as to what Trinity should do. I'm not worn out in that sense. I think it is a natural period, a point at which it would be an easy transition for a new president. I know perfectly well that from my own physical standpoint and my own interest in maintaining the kind of schedule this requires, I would not have wanted to do it more than two or three more years, anyway.

A series of both personal and public occurrences, as it were, seemed to dictate this is a very natural point at which to do it and in the

best interest of the institution, I hope. Certainly it seemed to make pretty good sense for me personally, too. But boy, overstaying is something that has happened many a time. On the other hand, I think it is very hard on an institution when you change them as often as Brown did in the early '70s. That was very hard on the institution. My mind is turning to Union again, but Union after Harold Martin left, has gone through three in a very fast sequence and that hurts.

PK: It has to.

TL: Yes, even though maybe all of us who are president have that illusion that we do make a difference and there are lots of people out there saying, "Presidents come and go. I can teach Zoology 1 and it doesn't make any difference to me." I think that's an exaggeration but I think you find out very quickly when you have a series of problems and turn them over fast, then that's not good for the institution.

PK: The political climate in this country during the late '60s and '70s, in particular with regard to Vietnam, how corrosive of an effect has that had on higher education. You mentioned earlier resident scars, are we still seeing the scars throughout higher education of that period?

TL: I think we have gone through a very natural cycle in the results of Vietnam, Cambodia period. Initially it was costly to higher education. The political response put us on the defensive and no matter how eloquently we defended our generosity to student radicals, we were put in a very awkward position where you couldn't win. There was virtually no way to get through it except move along, keep smiling and keep holding on to what principals of free speech, principals of

governance you had and hoped were in pretty good standing order, because you were going to get beaten on that one.

I think we obviously here at Trinity it cost us far less than at Berkeley or some place like that, or Columbia. After all, that was a very tough experience. It was not good here in a certain sense, but I think in terms of your question that it hung over us in very predictable terms for at least five, maybe ten years. Those alumni who felt that the college's response was not sufficient or our politics were wrong, it took them five to ten years to relax and say, "Well, you were still wrong but at least that's passed."

That in every conceivable form was out there, whether it was the corporation that didn't give money. Whatever form it came, a trustee would never forgive the sit in and so on, that lasted I think a good five to ten years.

What I think has happened is it has become past history. So many other things have come in upon us since then. Maybe Watergate was a blessing in that sense that something went wrong in the national government, not just in colleges and universities. Some of these things, I don't know quite of that works out sociologically but I'm sure as pressure points appeared elsewhere in the scene rather than on the campuses, that people's memories got a little less sharp.

I think what has happened today is that people would say, "Well, I barely remember. What was that all about? It was evidently not a great show, but the colleges seem to be pretty good now." That is, I think people with basic generosity would say that we recovered in pretty good shape and that it will not be an issue unless something

happens that inspires students to go back to radicalism and use the campuses for a base. That could conceivably happen, as we see the change in the philosophy of government, all these things come along. That could happen, in which case then we may have learned something from the '60s, although probably most of the people that were involved then won't be around to carry that experience in action. But there could be a similar kind of disenchantment and then I just don't know how we get through that. Right now people have sort of forgotten and largely forgiven.

The scars--I won't say scars, but the emblems of it are still in the college handbook now. All the elaborate procedures we established, all the things that we did in response are still there in the documents, not yet into the archives.

PK: That's right. How much influence did that activism have on trying to accomplish some of the things you wanted to do, coeducation? Did that have an impact on it in any way?

TL: No, I was glad we were trying to do so many other things at the same time. I hadn't thought of it in that way and then your question prompts me to say that thank goodness we had a lot of other things going. I think if we'd had to sit with that issue as the only issue, we would have gotten really worn out by this.

PK: You had the relief of other enterprises to draw on.

TL: Right, and as a matter of fact, occasionally in the years since then when some issue has come up that we knew was going to be tacky, we wondered whether we could have a diversion, raise some other issue and get everybody excited about so we could more calmly handle the

other issue. I think in a sense that we may have had less problem with some of the other issues because there was still a lot of fuss and feathers about radicalism and Vietnam and all that sort of thing.

Of course, as I sometimes put it, being in administration and particularly being president is sort of like a piece of bread in a toaster. It's find if you get burned on both sides evenly, but there is real hell to pay if it's working primarily on one side. In a sense you look back and we were getting burned by the students saying we were unresponsive and then the other side we were getting pushed for not doing something about the scene. It was all right as long as you didn't get too heavy from one side or the other. I think one of the reasons it didn't was that we were also--here the metaphor breaks down, but that the piece of toast was moving ahead. It wasn't stuck in the same toaster all the time. There may be some way to connect that metaphor.

PK: Why don't we conclude for today on this note and we'll pick up at our next interview session. I think we've reached a good stopping point.

TL: Well, you've been very tolerant. I didn't realize--I guess one of the --

End of Interview

PK: Continuation of interview with President Lockwood, May 13, 1981. I'd like to begin by asking you today, at the present time what do you think constitutes a liberal arts education? At this time in our society?

TL: Oh, my.

PK: There's a good tough question.

TL: Yes, that's a good one to start with. Well, I've often used a shorthand expression which only begins an answer. It seems to me a liberal arts education today really ought to help the individual understand himself--and I use that generically--understand himself and the world in which he now lives. In a sense, as a most general statement, that may be the best one to come with, but let me try to go into it a little more.

I have a feeling that one of the most complicated things for young people today is almost the absence of the definition of their place, their role, their expectations by a society which has in my view ever since the '60s and particularly the psychological impact of the Vietnam War, been very uncertain of itself. This is not quite comparable, say, to what the British Empire went through in the 20th century earlier or even Britain in terms of its position in the world in the late 19th century, but there is some parallel. Whereas, my generation grew up faced with doing something about a Depression and it seemed to me that younger people of my generation had a pretty clear notion of what we ought to try to do. Then we were faced with a war which was sufficiently clear and necessary, you might put it, that once again much of what we did was fairly well defined.

I think that understanding oneself means in effect finding those cultural links that are essential to this field or history of which you're a

part and the freedom, in a sense, to operate in it knowingly. That ranges clearly from a more philosophical speculation through the humanities, which should be dealing with this and sometimes do not as effectively as they might, into clearly fields that have grown in popularity such as psychology and sociology. In a sense, the departments represent and perhaps too clearly define how you get a handle on the position of man in a period and in a culture that has lost some of its self-conviction, some of its sense of central gyroscope.

The world in which we live seems to me where I become very concerned that the liberal education today provide what we use as a shorthand literacy. Namely the ability to communicate, which obviously is a whole field in itself. It's undergone such transformation just in the last decade, how we maintain information, how we recapture it, how we use it, how we transmit it. That ranges all the way obviously from television to computers and so forth. Being acquainted with that, the implications of the new systems and approaches to communications, is an important part of finding a way through this world.

But I mean by also literacy in what I would call the sciences, especially--and I'm not sure where that boundary is, but I've always argued that you have to have some way to explain your environment and we have traditionally in Western civilization turned to the sciences to provide explanations, descriptive or analytic ways to arrive at descriptions of our immediate environment, in a way that one could have said the environment might have been described by religious precepts or an assumption in earlier times.

So that liberal education probably ought to maintain the good case it hasn't changed that much in its goals, but certainly what is meant by the goal of knowing oneself and knowing the world in which you live, that has changed dramatically, what one needs in the way of knowledge and equipment.

I suppose your idealistic version is that in the process of developing those skills and acquiring that knowledge that the sorting out will begin in the undergraduate years, so that you can arrive at something that has always traditionally been called wisdom, and the ability to judge, discriminate and then to be sufficiently confident in your conclusions that you can operate off them, you can actually move through society and work with other individuals on the basis of some convictions and perceptions that you actually tested and thought about, rather than merely heard.

I suppose in a certain sense it is both the most difficult kind of education and it is also in a way that we don't publicize in the catalogues the most subversive. That is that is has to challenge what we have accumulated in order to both keep it up to date, reinterpret it and then to press for new explanations. Someone asked me once why you use the term: Search for truth. I said, "Well, one thing is that when you know something to be true, it is impossible to look at whatever that truth concerns in the same way ever again." If you suddenly see something that convinces you that it is the appropriate and proper explanation, then you can't shake it and it isn't tenuous any longer. It's fixed. You may suddenly find something later on that

causes you to question them, but at that moment in the search for truth, it precludes other explanation.

So I think in another way you are in an intellectual inquiry in liberal learning which ultimately has as its goal finding the truth as best we can determine it.

PK: That's very much a function of the individual to carry out that search as well, within the framework provided.

TL: Yes, and I think obviously it's been probably an Anglo-Saxon but maybe broadly a Western goal that the individual has to find that, that it rests on the individual, as opposed, I suppose, to obviously systems under which you could set up the syllabi and curriculum and faculty structure in a fashion that you are reinforcing established truths. If it were put that way and if that were the goal, then we would be much more interested in bringing a group through that process, rather you would tend to depreciate the importance of the individual.

So I think you're right in your implied emphasis obviously on all liberal education is on the individual, the individual arriving at a sense of what is worthwhile, what is important, what is true, what we can know and what we cannot know. All those add up to what I think we're in a very casual way calling these day "values." When we say that liberal learning is concerned with values, it is but that term has such looseness that if you don't watch it, you don't know really what you mean. All those ingredients add up to what then we value as important or establish as our highest values.

PK: How widespread is the perception in society today that this approach is valuable, especially in an age of technology?

TL: I'm still of the persuasion that people have far greater faith in that philosophy of education than in any other. I think we either have been successful in educating our predecessors so that they continue to believe it, or I think there is sufficient credibility in that approach, the significance that people will keep circling back to it, while at times, as you once again imply in your question, at a given moment in time they would say, "Well, we've got to have more specialists in this field or that field and you've got to train them." We obviously bend as those winds blow and people will say, "Well, it's all very nice to read a novel and think about wind condition and so forth," but in the meanwhile you better learn accounting. I think we're always facing that dilemma.

It was created after the [unclear]. Clearly we needed to do something about better training in agricultural and mechanical arts, so we founded the Land Grant Institutions because the other institutions hadn't found a way to move beyond training clergymen and doctors and lawyers. For that a more classical curriculum than you would accept as essentially liberal was made possible.

The other thing that I've found myself writing on frequently and troubled by is that in what we call liberal education or liberal learning, we also mean not only what we've been talking about but also the manner in which a faculty member approaches the subject. That is, once again the cliché way of phrasing it is that any course can be liberally taught, no matter what the subject matter; conversely, that even if English is taught totally as a mechanical exercise or literature becomes a thing where you are teaching skilling, as opposed to understanding and thinking, then I suppose it can be called "ill-liberal."

But the difficulty quite clearly over the last decade has been that the set of beliefs which people have had about what constitutes liberal teaching, as it were, how do you approach a subject matter with students so that it becomes a means of freeing the mind, that has been shaken badly I think. Partly by what's happened in specific disciplines, but partly because of the overwhelming accumulation of information we've had piling up now for a few decades and the feeling that until you have enough information learned in some manner, you can't really come to grips with the broader questions. To which I would answer that to teach, for example physics, yes, you need to know a great deal of what is almost rote information. That is, you can end up doing something very mechanically in the teaching of physics, unless you are aware that repeatedly you have to come back as to what this adds up to, why is it important to know these facts to be able to employ this formula. Unless you circle back and constantly get at that broader question, which I would call accommodating the environment or the universe, then I think you miss a great deal in liberal learning.

That's probably where we're having the greatest difficulty at the present, is how to both assure ourselves that that is occurring, that liberal learning does happen, and similarly what are the best ways in which to do it. Clearly the curricular debate that's been going on ever since sort of the breakdown in general education in the '60s, has been over that question and whether it is the way we approach the subject, whether it is a specific set of subject matter that you are after. There is a combination here that we haven't settled out how best to do it.

PK: Isn't that in part complicated by what could be perceived as an eroding skills base in the secondary education system that one time they could be counted on to provide? Are we not to a certain extent higher education today encountering people whose ability to understand is limited to a certain extent by lack of prior preparation?

TL: I guess to some degree. I guess I am instinctively unwilling to dump all our limitations on secondary education. I think it probably differs according to people. I think on the whole that quantitative manipulation has improved. Certainly what we teach in college mathematics is much more sophisticated than what we used to teach 30 years ago. The curriculum has advanced and part of that is a consequence of some improvements in like introduction to precalculas and so forth. At the same time, the development of calculators and all this has led to some short cuts that I think are perfectly reasonable. So that your assumption about ability to handle quantitative information I think you become more demanding or you make more assumptions of a more sophisticated nature.

Clearly where we're all worrying about now is what's happened on the verbal side, and that may be not only a breakdown in teaching people how to write and to some extent how to read, but we're struggling clearly with the impact of visual communications. The ear and the eye have become more important, in a sense, and the traditional book reading and so forth has no doubt suffered with telecommunication.

I think probably the most noticeable weakness, for which I have no explanation frankly, is the ability to reason. I think it at times looks

like a breakdown in teaching people how to write. That is, so few students seem to know what a paragraph does in writing or why one sentence follows another and what should be possible connections between sentences. That kind of absence of clarity in writing may be a function of the tremendous impact, particularly in urban schools, of people from quite different backgrounds, a perhaps looseness in the use of language. That is no longer a strong conviction that precision in language is worth all the effort. Just think of all the wonderful phrase, "well, you know." "You know what I mean," kind of phrase.

PK: You know, you know.

TL: Yes, precisely. I'm going far afield on this, but I guess it is time once again to do what we did in the '60s. Prior to the development of the open curriculum some of our faculty were in very close touch with some secondary school people trying to find out more clearly what kind of preparation students were receiving and what we might assume about that preparation, how that would affect our course design. We probably need to do more of that again. 0

The fact that in desperation some senior years have an Introduction to Psychology, Introduction to Philosophy and things, these may be sort of revelations of how unimpressive sometimes senior English, history is. But then leads those students to assume they really know something about fields which heretofore have been primarily begun at the undergraduate level. That may be an expensive shift in emphasis, particularly in senior years of school. You also have this terrible thing we see in our admissions folders constantly, Film I and II and Creative Approach to Life and a lot of things that remind one of

those very soft civics courses. But there seem to be a lot of these floating around that I guess are aimed at trying to keep seniors interested once they've applied to college.

PK: As you look at Trinity during your presidency, have you consciously had in mind any model of higher education that you used to measure the college?

TL: Until you added the last phrase, I thought I might have an answer. I'm not sure that one has any model to measure the progress of the college, but let me take a crack at it.

Recognizing that Trinity cannot be and never was meant to become a university, has been an important decision. If you divide higher education into sort of three kinds of what you might call boroughing groups. That is the institutions where a great deal of emphasis is placed on research, developing, being at the frontiers, developing new knowledge and so on and so forth, that burroughing approach. Then you clearly have institutions where it is sort of the other extreme to make sure you transmit faithfully what others have refined and developed. I put that in, for example, community colleges. That whole movement is designed to transmit a lot of particular information, some skills and transmission is the goal.

We obviously sort of fall in the third category where it is teaching in its finest sense. That is where you work at the honing of the mind where you are trying to develop intellectual skills and to deal with fairly sophisticated knowledge without going into original research, without making moles out of them. Therefore, as teachers you're going and testing and you are concerned with scholarship. You

are also concerned with transmitting information, but you have some other function that is very important, namely leading a student from where they are or he is, rather, and what he knows to another plateau or level of knowledge, perception and judgment. Therefore, it is that kind of institution, that is that goal that you're constantly measuring as to whether you've allowed too much of just teaching to occur.

For example, I always wonder how well our students who go onto graduate school are prepared. Do they know the latest or have they been fed something that was really bound to be obsolete ten years ago and all we've done is do a little mind training and a few other things, but you haven't really provided them with knowledge of a significant and still pertinent sense. It seems to me the obligation there is very heavy on us. So inevitably you are trying to have a faculty that is sufficiently aware of what's happening in the separate disciplines, to remain professionally alert. That for some requires writing and research. Others it may require their being just very active in their profession, keeping up with the reading and so forth.

But I think you're measuring the institution against that middle road and we know we can never be in a position where you're in a sense just sponsoring scholars with relatively few students, but you're dealing primarily with bringing students to some degree of intellectual maturity.

So I tend to look at it and measure it in terms of whether we really are moving along and are staying alert. Do we have a group of professional people who have consciously chosen to teach primarily

rather than do research and writing work and just view students either as [unclear] or just as a way to get paid?

The other aspect that seems to me the model I also keep in mind and try to figure out how Trinity's doing, how we in our artificial segregation according to departments I am concerned that there be a lot of cross talk and interdisciplinary work. Whether it takes the form of team teaching or whether it takes the form of symposia we had for a few years running, or whether it's the fact that you have a small enough faculty they ought to be able to get together across fields and find something to talk about. Because I think the thing--this goes back a little to liberal education in this day and age--much of what is very important in human experience --

[end of side 2, tape 2]

PK: Side A, continuation of interview with President Lockwood, May 13, 1981. You were talking about the difficulty of some of the new areas of concern in the country not falling discretely into disciplines.

TL: Yes, and my point being that as you look and try to measure Trinity's progress as an academic teaching institution, I have to constantly try to figure out ways and encourage the people looking at issues beyond the boundaries of the perspective of their own disciplines because it seems to me that that does contrast us in our educational mission from a university where clearly it is almost the subdivisions within a discipline where the most important research is occurring, until it reaches a point where you have the idea men go to work at a very refined level.

We're obviously trying to take what we know in one field and see how it may relate and help with problems surfacing in another field.

I guess that's an important one because I don't know of any other institution that can do that without--the Institute of Advanced Studies can do that, but for the most part the universities are nonstructured, their size is prohibitive. We do have the chance to work as--just to use an illustration, when Bob McNally got [unclear], he got in touch with the physics department to help him with some of the astronomy in it and so forth. You can work across and that's something it seems to me we have a particular obligation, we should measure ourselves against our ability to relate the fields and relate as faculty one to another on common problems.

That's why I suppose another thing we've set up college professorships to encourage that. We've encouraged courses where they are problem oriented where you are going to have to bring people in from more than one discipline to get a handle on a particular issue. You can't do that all the time. Pretty soon I think you do need the solidity of the established discipline. You need to do regular work in those fields where obviously both faculty and students can learn in a sufficiently systematic way and it doesn't become too diffused, too discursive.

Anyway, you asked how I measured. I think those are a couple of the ways I would measure.

PK: Let's go on and talk, if we may, about the financial situation of the college. You mentioned in one of our earlier sessions that as you arrived on campus you had been able to pinpoint some problems that you had seen with regard to the general financial condition of the

college. How have you been able to address these and how do you put the condition of the finances at this point?

TL: Well, there have only been about three phases even in these short thirteen years. The first was clearly our one thing we had found--no one created it. We had a commitment to financial aid which if you stopped and looked at it, was every five years it was going to at least double the college contribution. We were on a very risky course there, so what we had to do was to slow down the commitment from the college for financial aid, flatten the slope enough so that as the college grew we could put more money into it, but not let it get out of hand because that was going to be a problem.

The other thing was the growth had been so substantial over the years in terms of faculty, staff and services that we needed to project those out. As I think I said earlier, one of the difficulties was we were very inexperienced in colleges and universities at projecting out and seeing the financial consequences because we had gone through such a period of expansion and not quite seen the relationship between growth and you might see the ultimate eventual financial implication to growth.

Therefore, for example, in that first period we flattened off somewhat the financial aid commitment, we reduced the administration somewhat in size. As a matter of fact, in 1970 we froze the expenditures in administration. That I suppose was on the one hand a device to prevent any further deficits. It was also a way of forcing some water wherever it existed, out of the budget. That is, quite clearly when we could afford it, we did things and we did them. It was nice to be able to, but eventually you have to find some way to restrain

the impulse for the new things that are always worthy but not necessary.

So that when we had a small deficit, something around 80,000 in '69 and then in '70 it was 200,000, we began the shutting down process very quickly. We also began to get a real handle on what size faculty we had. It was striking to me that when I thought we had 121 faculty--if you counted up the names of the full time faculty that was what it came to--and then to add up from a budget point of view the other faculty whom we were hiring on a part time basis and so forth, we found we had 130 faculty and that was where that particular myth grew. I said we had to sit with 130 faculty. Then clearly as we had projected just as part of the longer range plans to increase the student body, we knew we would greater productivity and we'd begin to get income and expenses in better shape.

As a matter of fact, the one thing I would point out--it may be in some of the material some place, but we never lost track of those two years of deficit. So subsequently we paid back into the endowment that which we had borrowed from the principal.

There also had been a tendency, I think because we had been able to build very nicely the athletic center and the life sciences, that we thought we could keep on going with our building program. I was impressed with the speed with which our maintenance costs were rising, so once again we kind of put a temporary brake on that kind of expenditure, even though that's outside the budget.

The second phase came when we recognized that, yes, we had gotten the cost side under control and had worked out a whole series of

cost control mechanisms that were operating pretty well. We realized, however, that the Ford campaign '66-68 had ended up giving us very little loose change. It was very ironic that we virtually had to use all but a million dollars for building costs and a great deal of money had come in kind buying books for the library and all that sort of thing, but that hadn't been added to endowment. We were faced with an endowment which was over 22 million or something, and as the college began to grow it was apparent to me that we were taking care of the short term because of the rise in size and keeping some of the other things in line. We were catching up and getting a better income flow, but we were reducing the value of the endowment measured on a per student basis. That is, the income per student was going down. That was something I had begun to spot, too. So that led me to believe not only we needed to go into another capital campaign to try to build up the endowment, but we also needed to look at the whole investment strategy of endowment, which we did. It's a wonderful thing if you can gain 1% more in return, that begins to make a difference. That we needed to add moneys to the endowment was quite clear.

So there was a sort of second phase in which after having brought the costs under control and gotten the cash flow situation where we knew we could be on a balanced budget, then we had to build up reserves and resources that we had never had at this institution. I think this is one of the things people forget is that Trinity was a relatively small and not well endowed institution after the Second World War. Thanks to [unclear] we had made a lot of

progress, but what we ran the risk of was really dissipating that base or trying to stretch it across too many projects, too large a commitment.

So we then systematically went out and did fund-raising and at the management of the endowment and developed a much better return and of course were helped in a sense by the arrival of inflation.

Therefore, the third phase, which we're still in to some degree, is learning to live with inflation as another factor in the financial management process. In many ways I have great trouble understanding why other institutions couldn't get their budgets under control and operate on a balanced basis.

I think I said on the very outset it's funny, people think of me as an economist. I am not. All I did was recognize some very simple things, namely that life was much pleasanter if you could keep your budget balanced and in a sense it was totally arbitrary what that budget figure was. All it did was express a series of priorities about where you were going to spend money and what your sources of income were, and you just wound up with an imbalance, rather than kid yourself.

So we clearly had to recognize in an inflationary time what that rising cost was going to do to some of our previous strategies. In a sense it was both a blessing and obviously a distress signal. The short term rates covered almost all the increases in energy costs initially in '73, '74, '75. In other words, the coincidence of short term money enjoying higher rates and fuel costs going up, we didn't get into great trouble because we totally underestimated what we'd get in short term

and of course how much we'd have to pay on fuel. But they kind of wiped out one another, fortunately.

Inflation also, though, meant a lot of movement in our endowment, which we then began to really work at systematically and of course now the endowment is very close to being 50 million. I'm not measuring any of this in constant dollars because I don't find that a very cheerful exercise, but I think we've entered now a new period where we are trying once again and we're using the same things when we put a freeze on the size of the faculty and we forced a reduction in size of the faculty and have cut back, as we announced to the faculty yesterday, we've cut back nine positions in the administration over the last two years. Mainly junior level, but we're recycling some of the same techniques we used before to keep this in a solvent and viable state. I think that's important.

What nobody can guess and nobody wishes to project is whether we are in a very critical financial position in colleges of this kind. It happens we're the best off, those of us who have endowments of this sort. We are. After all, Trinity is one of the richest colleges in the country, even though we act and talk as if we weren't.

The problem is will the combination of inflation and its parallel in rising cost so drive our prices up that we will be in a very fragile market situation, to use uncomfortable terminology.

PK: I was going to ask tuition increase.

TL: We're obviously driving it finely at a very brisk pace, and we operated for many years on the philosophy which I take full responsibility for, of being somewhat behind inflation and certainly behind the leaders in

terms of increases in cost of tuition. We played the austerity came fairly effectively. We've moved onto a more aggressive position now and all of us who are among the high priced wonder what the consequences will be.

Certainly it helps us in the short run. Once again, we will be able to maintain our services. We will be able to pay better salary increases and so forth by driving tuition, but the thing is if it increases at the rate it has been, 10-15% tuition increases every year, then you are going to be much more dependent on those tuition dollars. The income from endowment just cannot advance as fast, cannot yield 10-15% each year and it will not grow at the rate of 10-15% each year. So then that very real support we have from endowed funds will shrink as a portion of our total income, and that's where I become worried that all of us higher priced institutions may drive ahead in a fashion that will imperil a more balanced economy within higher education.

I don't know the answer there, but clearly in order, ironically, to have a diverse student body you've got to charge tuitions that make as an upper class institution by any socio-economic analysis. But that's the only way you can generate the money to redistribute to financial aid, so on and so forth.

There are a lot of ironies built into the fiscal situations of colleges and universities and we may have a very interesting decade trying to work those out. None of us quite see yet where that's headed.

PK: [unclear] is the role of the vice president for financial planning.

TL: That's why we created the position. We began to feel that there were two separable functions in an institution, even this small, if you want to

put it that way. You have the treasurer/comptroller role which is absolutely essential. That is you've got to keep track of the money. Chartered accounts for colleges--I find my corporate friends amazed when they hear this. We have a chartered accounts, more separate accounts than United Technology.

PK: That's extraordinary.

TL: A lot of them are nickel-dime stuff, but you've got a tremendous range of things you're keeping track of. So you've got that, plus when you're dealing--now we're up to 19 million dollars--you've got a big dollar commitment. You are dealing with billing that's a very complicated process. You are dealing with 2,000 people, students--2500 in terms of in and out checks. You've got a tremendous obligation to make sure all of that is well managed, kept track of. So you have the treasurer/comptroller function that's a major one.

To ask a treasurer and comptroller who makes the broad decisions there, also to be responsible for the long-range planning, the oversight of the endowment, to relate physical plant planning to academic planning and so forth, it was clear that was too much. A president may have been able to do this decades ago, but even as one who has always had great fascination with planning and who also has a very fast pencil, according to the treasurer, on the budget--I mean these are things I like to dabble around in. It was clear I couldn't do the job, so we got in a vice president. [unclear] died very unexpectedly after coming here, then we were fortunate enough to get Jim English as our vice president, which may have been one of the most important appointments I ever made in the institution because he has a good

sense of process. He has a good way of coming at this issues, as well as being fiscally very shrewd.

That I think is the other thing that has happened in colleges and universities, I may not have mentioned before. Most colleges and universities until very recently have not been process conscious. That is, they have not set up long range projects where you begin to look at things and you review it again in two years and you pick it up and see what's happened and watch the trend lines, and as you change some of the variables see what the consequences are and so forth. We have now become pretty adept at that in most areas of the college. We didn't do the institution research. No one had time and we didn't know what to do with the information if we ever got it.

I think this is pertinent both to fiscal and non-fiscal issues alike, to develop a way to process what is happening, incorporate it, analyze it out and decide whether things are going along pretty well or whether here is obviously a trouble zone. We have seen this coming. I suppose the one that has moved at a snail's pace but the snail keeps going in the same direction is our graduate studies program. I saw that one as troublesome, even when I was here as a trustee. Then it became even clearer after [unclear] was associate dean for graduate studies. I appointed him when I first came here and studied on and said the trends were all against that growing, and among other things we elected to not spend the money for an associate dean, so he left.

I think there is a case we are working through and right now we have, you might say, study number three and phase three of four or five phases in terms of our seeing what kind of other educational services

we can provide because if we don't think that one through, it will fall to pieces and we'll all be trying to figure out what happened. Planning is the way to avoid being mystified by your own misfortune. [laughs]

PK: How about support of higher education just in general, do you see any trends for the future? Private support, government support?

TL: I think there have been three major developments that effect it critically. Number one is that when many foundations were put onto the 40 year life or they had to spend 5% each year and that kicks them into a new pattern of giving, that has helped in some instances. Larger foundations have been putting more money into higher education. Like [unclear] have increased the amounts they've given to memorial trust. A few of those that have been very generous to us have actually kept up with the pace and done a little better in disbursing their funds and that's been a help.

The smaller foundations in effect are drying up. They are unable and it's much easier like the Merrill Trust is going out of being and that's happening. So one of the things is the number of sources of foundation support for higher education are diminishing, even though some of them are still a good size and dispersing more money. So it makes the competition more intense and the special funds are harder to find.

The second thing is that just this last year for the first time in history corporate giving to higher education exceeded foundation giving. That's a happy trend, but it tends to be taking two distinct forms that pose some issues that we're analyzing out now. One is the new fascination with matching gifts from alumni or challenge gifts

which the institution has to match. The matching, the leverage principal appeals to the corporate world and that puts a lot of pressure on the management of colleges to get those matching gifts in in order to generate the new sources.

So corporate giving has gone up and it is undoubtedly more unimportant, but also in terms of the matching principal it will pose some issues that I think we can solve, but are new instances.

The other aspect of corporate giving is tending to be sorted out and I'm sure the process will go on for another four or five years, whether it should have some connection with the particular enterprise or whether it's sheer philanthropy--you go use the money however you wish. I think most corporations feel they need the defense against the stockholders or they want to identify their giving more directly with their kind of business, so I've noticed we can get support more easily if it's for an internship program which actually may offer them some students becoming members of the corporation or it will be to train minority actuarials or something like that. You begin to get that kind of linkage, which you can manage but it gets a little more complicated after a while, particularly for the liberal arts institution. It's no surprise that a lot of corporate giving is more directed toward business schools and so forth.

So that's a new development, but corporate giving is clearly going to emerge as larger and larger for the third factor that is just beginning now. None of us know what is going to happen with federal and state funding. Clearly there is not going to be as much largesse in Washington and that puts pressure on corporations from all sorts of

sectors. It is a change in philosophy to say, "Well, you have to cultivate the individuals who can give you a hand, or find your own way through, or lower your ambitions," or whatever it may amount to.

I just saw the other day for the first time an attack upon private institutions in this state by the public institutions. Now, we've always had a good relationship and certainly when Homer Babbidge was at the University of Connecticut, we worked together very well speaking on behalf of higher education as a whole. That is true even today with the university, but the state colleges have taken off their gloves and they just are out to knock out of the budget the scholarship program for independent colleges. They didn't get away with it this year, but for the first time--I've got a copy of the testimony and it's an attack. It's going to be an attack and that's happening in other states.

I know in Wisconsin some of the small colleges got together to sort of plead for a little help from the state against the big institutions and it was sort of like the Norton fight--in 54 seconds they were on the mat and didn't know what had hit them. Nobody's going to be that polite anymore because the state institutions, reading the situation, know that the states aren't going to be as generous. Obviously, we don't want to see taxes go up so tax dollars are not going to produce the revenues to support them in the manner in which they have become accustomed. The big systems like California and New York are--they've gotten--

PK: [unclear]

TL: Yes, because they've lived for a while with two and a half percent salary increases every year, but eventually they get tired of that.

They've squeezed out the things that they probably didn't need to be doing and now when they see the real battle for the dollar occur, they're going to say, "We do more at a lower price and you placed your faith in us. We are a public institution, not snobbish, elitist, etc., etc." That battle I think will also affect the whole funding problem as we go forward. Just where that comes out, I don't know.

The irony that works in our favor here is that it is precisely the people who have supported the cutbacks in Washington, they have a philosophy which in effect has to, if it's going to be consistent, support the efforts of the independents and the privates. They should not be in favor of seeing the public squeeze the private sector out of education, but remember in higher education we have fallen from 1950 after the war, 50% of all students went to a private institution. It was 25% in the 1970s. It's down to 22% now. Even though we've been growing a little bit in a way that sometimes surprises us, still the percentage of the whole picture is that community college development, everything else has conspired to see us shrink a little bit further as a percentage.

PK: How competitive are we now?

TL: I think we're very competitive. I think Trinity got into alumni fund-raising late in the game and we really didn't do a great deal until Burt Holland was the one who began to develop that. We have just begun really to work with the reunion class gift approach and so forth. Our alumni have not had the exposure, experience, whatever you call it, with giving in the same sense that a Dartmouth alumni would have.

We're attacking that, getting better but we have a ways to go and that's in the sense as a potential. I think in foundation gifts we have

been very good, particularly in the last few years. We had a dry period for a little bit and we didn't do quite as well in our capital campaign with foundations as I hoped, but what I have always known and have learned yet again to be true, it takes a long way to cultivate a foundation. Despite all the efforts to be objective, it is quite clearly personal. As I have gotten to know many of these people well over the years, it begins to pay off.

I think with the Kenan Trust--we have a Kenan Professorship. When I first arrived here, I discovered the reason we had never been considered, not that we would necessarily have been considered, was that they thought we were a church school and despite the number of times Burt Holland and Al Jacobs may have gone down and knocked on that door, somehow they got that in their bonnet. It took three or four years to really dissuade them of that notion. Then another three years to convince them this was really a very good institution. It was like, "How many times do I have to come back and tell you?" I think part of it was a game, of course. "How often will you come back and tell us?" But there was a long time before they really knew and accepted Trinity as being part of their very small group of institutions that they consider worthy of a professorship.

I think we've done well in that sector. Corporate giving we have a very distorted picture. We have done for our size very well with a limited number of corporations. In general terms we have not been successful, and that's partly because only as the classes of the '60s have spread out into many other corporations than is traditionally populated, can we see some outreach.

I think also the record of our parents has been remarkable, almost unique in higher education. Our parents have played an important part here and we probably have spent as much time keeping that going as any because it's been a disproportionately important part of our funding.

PK: You mentioned the alumni. It's important to realize that there are more and more alumni out there who are [unclear]. It seems to me that has to be a great hope for the future.

TL: It is, but we're going to go through a trough. It's not public information but I think in a sense it's important to this record is that we must realize that those who, like George Farris and others, we have gone through in a sense the old alumni who give big gifts. We've gone through that generation. We've combed it pretty thoroughly. We will get bequests and they'll be important and significant, but the big donors, they're names are still alive. We know what's there and we know what's coming. We have a fair number of bequests, a lot more than we ever used to have, that are on the books, as it were, which will come in in time. What we do not have out there at the moment are a new--we don't have from the '30s and early '40s that many large potential donors. We do not have many George Farrises coming along in the next five to ten years who will be in a position where they've got to get rid of it, either because they can't take it with them or for tax reasons or something.

You're quite right. We're going to have to be very patient and work our way through and then I think we'll be in fine shape by 1990 on. We will have a very good flow, if we continue to merit that kind of

support. The flow will be there but this is not at all unusual. I've been at enough other institutions to know that despite what they've been putting looks like in some instances better records than ours in fund-raising of late, I know they're getting it while they can because they face the same problem we all face. The '30s was the Depression. People got off too late in their career or whatever it was. It would be kind of fun to trace out, but clearly we're all going to be--the 6 million dollar gift to Swathmore is the wonderful exception and there will be those flukes, but for the most part the statistics just show clearly that we're going to go through a bit of a slow growth here before we probably move into a whole new level of giving that will be very significant.

PK: I think finances and the question of support leads naturally to my next question which has to do with how well we have cultivated relations with the community here in Hartford, our home base. What progress have we made on that front?

TL: I'm sure my view as a historian--it would be fun sometime to bring in six taxi drivers and two vice presidents and something else to find out, but my assumption is our relations with our community and with the city have changed quite substantially over the last decade or so. We had our connections with the city. We never lost them, but the thing that happened and historically I think will be the next thing we will have to look at is we were a city college in the '30s and '40s. Half of us commuted. This entering class we have only eight students who are not going to be living on campus. So the game changed.

After the war and when we built up our residential college, inevitably one of the consequences of that was we were perceived as no longer a city college. When the University of Hartford was created which after all Trinity could have been. Trinity was offered that option and we turned it down. When that came into being, we then not only weren't the city college, but they had one finally and we were therefore pushed more out and into being that regional international institution which had nothing to do with the city and therefore was snobbish.

That cut both ways because that was the distinguished institution. "That's, of course, the national institution. We've got our local one." That's the plus side. The other side was, "They don't have much to do with the community any more." Yet, individuals like Burt Holland and Al attended every Rotary meeting that was ever held in the city of Hartford. I don't know how he did it, but anyway there were those individually but as an institution except for the [unclear] Study which was in '66 to consider what might be done in the neighborhood, I think the pulling away process was a very real one.

Certainly our faculty pulled out of the city and started living in the neighborhood. The students stayed more and more here. We were less and less a local institution, particularly as some of the prominent alumni who had served on the trustees, they began to get out of the college, die and so forth. We have had no replacements, you see. We have no distinguished alumni in key positions in the city of Hartford to speak of. No Henry Geers, Lyman Brainard, Jack Imars and so forth. Those have gone pretty much, as the whole structure and management and so forth.

I think now what we've had to do is to find new ways and I think that's been important from both my point of being involved more and with the appointment of Jim English. We got a kind of automatic plus there. We got an outreach connection which really has been very important, certainly to the corporate world.

To the community, of course, the decision to grant from the Hartford Foundation the what was then the community relations office. I was determined. We had to find some way. I could see more trouble. One didn't have to look at Columbia and their gymnasium problem. We could see it coming right down the block. We knew we had to do something, but the first thing to do was to find out what we could and couldn't do, rather than dash out and offer to plant trees up and down Broad Street. We had to find something, so we started that.

Then it seemed both tactically wise and a much more substantial contribution could be made by three institutions working together, so we created the South Side Institution of Neighborhood Alliance with the hospital and the Institute of Living. I think it's been the closer relations among the three of us and the efforts through the South Side News, which we subsidized, these efforts that we've made some progress in reinserting ourselves in an acceptable pattern and way into the neighborhood again.

We're not home yet on this one, but we at least have ways of doing it. We're back into the Chamber and we're doing more and helping approach City Hall. I think the creation of the Greater Hartford Consortium for Higher Education, which is important, these are all steps which at times may be more symbolically important than they are

practically and significant. Yet, without them I think our relations would be poor indeed and we might be standing off all the time or raising an electric fence.

I think we had no choice and the question we now face is so we spend $25,000 toward our side or $30,000 a year on the side and effort--maybe we should spend 100,000 doing far more. Maybe it's so clearly in our self interest to help in any way we can to improve the neighborhood because it has some negative impact on our ability to attract students, maintain security and so forth. Well, I think we would if we knew how. That's the trick that every community wishes they knew the solution to that trick.

PK: As you suggest, it's also a practical one related to the question of security.

TL: Sure, sure, but not solely. Rural colleges have security problems, too.

PK: Of course they do.

TL: But I think it's the perception of the institution as being "in the city and you know what cities are like these days. Look at all those ethnic groups." Whatever horrible form it takes, it's a fact that if I had a choice I may want to go elsewhere, even though some people come here obviously because we are in the city. But I think it is something that poses a particular problem for us that you don't have with say Middlebury.

PK: And also the effort in regard to internships of putting the students out. That's important.

TL: Yes, and I think we have tried, perhaps not assiduously enough, to say "Here we are in a world of liberal arts colleges"--I don't regard Tufts

University as a liberal arts college anymore. We are the one that's located in the city. This is an unusual opportunity. It isn't all a deficit. It's very much a plus and we do provide opportunities and that has been important, there is no doubt, in getting some students. Whether students came here because of it or not, those who have participated have learned a great deal they could not learn in a different setting. It is I think an opportunity, but I think it's too early to tell how that balance sheet will work out.

I also would maintain, in keeping with my own philosophy of education, that to be able to test some of your ideas in practice, if you're a psychology major you can do work at the Institute, or if you're in political science you can observe what's happening at the capital. There are opportunities to test ideas in action which might be an important part of any undergraduate experience more easily in this setting. But it does define our situation somewhat differently than other institutions.

PK: How would you characterize the quality of life on campus? Perhaps to what it was when you came here the first year.

TL: Oh, I'm sure I would say initially disappointing.

[end of side 1, tape 3]

TL: I think certainly since I've been here--I'm not even sure how one applied the quality of life to periods which initially seemed to be chaotic in the sense that you had political activity that was kind of fun in the sense that it seemed to be serious when there were those who were playing games with it, to the very depressing introduction of drugs, the arrival of drugs in full force onto the campus right at the

same time and sort of on the heels of the political movement. I found it incredible that if I issued a memorandum to the student body deploring the use of drugs and saying we would not protect them against narcs coming on campus, that we had no intention and if anyone was caught exploiting students by peddling drugs we would expel them, that evidently the sewer system practically clogged up the next day. They were flushing them down.

What you say about the quality of life, on the one hand there was a serious about the political issues; on the other hand there was an escapism and a movement that became very pronounced from when we were first meeting off on those four or five hundred at those all college convocation meetings, college meetings to appoint where seemingly five years later if you could get twenty together who would stay together for more than a half your, you were fortunate.

As drugs passed from the scene, then we got a kind of cynicism plus a narrowness of concern that left the campus, it seemed to me, less vibrant and concerned for others less pronounced. I think the quality of life changed again as it seemed to me the small group gratification, if you want to call it that, or the willingness of a few people to share everything, all their concerns almost in T-groups with one another, seemed to become a dominant pattern and if something else was happening down three entries, "None of my problem."

I don't know how to describe the quality of life because it has tended to change. I'm not sure a generation of students lasts more than about two years and it begins to modify. Now we seem to have a group at least who are willing to face up to issues. That may be the

maturing of our coeducational experience that we have women now much more active on campus and bringing their perspective in common with obviously a national movement to improve the position of women in the society. We have had great fluctuation among our blacks in terms of their willingness to be active, to participate or to withdraw. So that it's an amalgam of things that have been happening.

Now with the awareness day this spring on April 23rd, why here you have some first signs of maybe some more collegiality returning and more students, larger groups of students willing to sit down and consider. Whether that will evaporate on us very quickly or whether it will lead to strengthening the student government and some wider concerns. It was a constructive effort. Whether it is part of a new wave, I'm not ready to predict.

PK: I'll ask you later about the question of student government. As a student in the '60s there was a pretty strong student government. [unclear] What about the level of intellectual curiosity on campus throughout these years. Let's say in the last ten years, has there been any noticeable fluctuation?

TL: I think so. It may be a substantial generalization to say that there were more people willing to display their intellectual curiosity and versatility when I first arrived. We had had, obviously, some very bright people here in the '60s. We had a higher incidence than I think was true earlier in the college's history. We had a better student body, and I leave alumni commentary to one side. But we've had better students for two decades and in that group I would say there were more intellectually curious people earlier, the late '60s and early '70s.

Perhaps the attractiveness of being known as intellectual has worn off or disappeared or been replaced or downgraded, so that my impression is there are fewer who are genuinely intellectual curious than before--or who display it as obviously as Carl Mahen and a number I can think of earlier.

Now, having said that, on the other hand, we have two curious things that have happened. One, with great inflation we obviously have had more Phi Betas. I don't know that the two are necessarily linked. As a matter of fact, Phi Beta is trying to keep it from being linked, so they try to be more discriminating, but we've had more Phi Beta Kappa people. These very often turn out to be the zeroes in mathematics who are just good in mathematics and have a little trouble finding much else to contribute to on campus.

They tend to be the people who are the specialists who are thinking ahead to the next stage of their work and so forth, just don't go around displaying it in the tripod, although [unclear] did. A very bright guy and he's the kind you're thinking of, of course.

I don't know whether it has been the change in our dominant values on campus, namely a sort of seriousness in getting ready for a career, a lack of humor, whether these things sort of say, "Oh, well, if I'm the intellectual type I'll keep it well enough hidden and I'll go out and have a drink instead." I don't know whether the values have shifted enough that this is just not a very popular thing to do, step forth and be intellectually curious publicly, you might say.

I think a lot of good things are happening. A number of people are doing special lab work and every one of the sciences has doubled

or trebled. I just would not believe they're doing the things they're doing, but they're doing it very quietly. I think the other thing that I have been, of course--an outgrowth of the worry about where are the intellectuals now, we created the President's Fellows as a way to bring out a group of our ablest seniors, bring them together to get them to talk about things, their own experiences and intellectual life or more generally, the future of mankind--whatever we could get them interested in. That has been like a yo-yo. One year it's an interesting group where we can talk about Hile Berner's condition of mankind and the next year you're lucky if you can get out of the caves. It's all kind, "Why don't you fix up Mather Hall?" and you're wondering whether these are the best students we have, if they haven't got a thought about what liberal education should be? Maybe they don't even speak--I don't know whether you can ever get a clear impression because I have a feeling it is affected so much by what peer pressure says is the way you make it.

I don't think you find the top person in a class playing a major public role.

PK: Do you think that might be colored by the society perception at large that intellectual inquiry as such is not something [unclear]?

TL: I think it's part of privatism. I think there is nothing to be gained and there isn't enough pressure to do things on behalf of the community at large that you have to do if you're a bright person. You don't need that stage and a lot of things conspire to let you do it privately. I think as always the bright student around here, the faculty pile up options and get him to do more and more. That's something they never realize.

They could never get as much out of a big institution because they wouldn't be pushed around as much in a sense, they wouldn't be told "Why don't you write an extra essay on this or do something on that?" That's one of the gifts we offer.

I think a number of things keep that person in the background. I think conversely it is the student who is not all that able intellectually who may very self-consciously--and I can think of some in this year's senior class--who have decided to move out and do other things and make a record for themselves, so that when they apply to business school or whatever, "Well, I have a good record here. I was head of my House. I did this. I was doing that." I think that that there is a lot of social applause for.

I'm sure I'm out of my depth and I'm not sure any of us really understand that clearly what happened to today's young man going into college. He certainly is as worried about the crease in his pants as he is going to Yale at the end of the century.

PK: Let me ask you about the role of women in the faculty and the administration. [unclear] great advance for the college.

TL: Yesterday we're recognizing the first woman instructor at Trinity who has been here now 25 years, Margaret Butcher. She is the first full professor.

PK: I have very fond memories of Mrs. Butcher, yes, indeed.

TL: That says something. We only have to go back 25 years to see the first woman faculty member. I think it has not been as difficult--tongue in cheek--to add them to the faculty as most of our older faculty were convinced it would be. I think the professional opportunity for a

woman and the challenge of coming to Trinity has been almost irresistible. That is, it is a very good institution. It doesn't really know that well what a professional woman can do and so forth. So I think they have come in and when they've shown spunk and drive and ability, we're push overs in a kind of funny, ironic way. The problem is obviously there hasn't been enough mobility. There hasn't been that many openings so the proportions still do not look that impressive. I think we have come a long way with the faculty and this is important to women students, but I think also that it is clear this country has been going through and presumably despite Regan, will continue to go through adjusting to the fact that women are equal and are very intelligent.

I heard a funny one the other day when we were having a first effort by Trinity College and the Hartford Graduate Center to offer a joint workshop was two directors of local corporations on What Does it Mean to be a Director of a Corporation. Three of us who don't know much about it moderated. One of the well known local chief executive officers said if he had his druthers, he'd have all women on his board. They work harder, they tend to be brighter and they certainly are aggressive. [laughs]

I think we've got to learn how to live with this. So I think that's important and I think when you stop to think about it, that's what we're trying to do is to help ourselves understand, help our students understand and of course bring in their perspective. Bob Ford always used to make this great point when we'd meet with the faculty, that women look at physics different than men. I don't know whether that's

true or not, but I'm sure there is something that their perspective, their look at the world is one we have pretty well ignored and may now well pay greater attention to.

In terms of the staff I think it's been very important because we have largely home grown in our staff and to recognize that we have some very able women, in some cases who were not properly recognized and we now have brought up into staff status. To bring in some able women, to promote those who obviously--[unclear] now become one of the best known fund-raisers in the east. I think it's been great because once again they've helped us over a lot of problems in coeducation. They've helped us understand and I think in many positions they are very effective, indeed. They do have a professional commitment because they have made almost a more self-conscious decision to enter careers. We all just assume we have to work. We didn't have much choice, and that's not quite the same thing as saying, "I'm definitely going to do this as a career." There may be enough of a distinction there that it's kind of fascinating to watch.

You know, the library has been one of the few fields where women were very prominent all along.

PK: You can almost make an argument for diversity that there aren't enough men in [unclear].

TL: That's right. So I think it's been important. The thing you worry about is in the face of fairly steady state, as they call it, in the academic world, lack of mobility, high percentages on tenure, not too many other job opportunities for people in the academic world to suddenly move over. They're not going to be asked to save Chrysler or something, so

what do they do? We will not get enough turnover perhaps to be at the point that we would like in terms of women in staff and faculty positions, but it's a far different Trinity than it used to be.

PK: Coeducation I think must have helped in some ways.

TL: Well, it's helped. Obviously, it's helped but at the same time it's created some problems. I mean it's put more heat on us. We could have drifted along maybe a little more slowly. One never knows. I suppose one of the fascinations of being the chief executive at times as we've chatted I begin to feel a little happier about what has occurred over 13 years and then you hit another topic or something and you suddenly say, "Oh, Lord, if you had only done this," or, "If you'd only really pushed harder at that point in time..." Those judgments as you go along which are really gloomy ones because the easiest thing in the world--here I will get sidetracked, but just for a moment because it is pertinent. Of course, the easiest thing is when people on a staff present you with proposals to do something and you can sort of react. It's all spelled out and if you don't think it's clear enough you send it back and say, "It's not timely enough," or, "Try again," or whatever. But it's the ones where you get no memoranda, you get no advice, you ought to have the kind of instinct that you better start looking at or doing something. You talk to somebody and, "Oh, that's interesting," and you don't get any concrete response. You're just flying out there on your own best judgment. Those are the ones that I feel that no one quite appreciates how much of the time we're doing that, and the only way you get any feel as to whether it's right is that nothing happens and you say, "Well, I guess it wasn't all that bad," or you get a reaction and

then you decide whether to face it down or you go on back around and come at it from a different angle.

In contrast to, for example, MIT where I worked Trinity is not a memorandum college. It is not a place where everybody sends up proposals all the time. There's a steady flow of paper, maybe a little too much. I send out notes and I get back memos. I mean that's my own fault--I shuffle around a lot of stuff. But there are institutions where either it is the game or it's almost the institutional way of operating is everybody tries out the memo of the day to see if their idea has any popularity or whether you can dissuade somebody. At MIT it seemed to me, just in that school of humanities, it was hard to keep up with your reading every day of everybody's memoranda about one thing or another. "Throw out Hegel." "Bring in Hegel," or whatever it was.

This is a different atmosphere here and we have always had, I have felt, a softer way of doing things. We kind of let them bubble a little bit and we begin to see it and kind of move in. As I think I said once before, we tend to blunt things earlier and we also probably haven't, as an institution, developed the kind of mode that says put everything in contrasting positions and then let's see who wins or who's paper is heavier.

It's a very strange style that we have. I do not know another institution that quite functions the way we do, and nobody else seems to understand that when they come here. They don't quite believe the way we do things, even though they may admire or not the results. They just don't quite know how we get at the results, given sometimes

the style in which we operate which is what I think is a very congenial one, but not as managerially crisp. Crisp at times, but not as discernible. It's harder to get a handle on how things happen.

Every student who has ever come to ask me about how--I'll take a case, "How is this decided," and after they've heard it, "Oh, well. I'm sorry I asked the question. I don't understand how anything happens," and they walk out. I don't see that in defense or in praise of it necessarily, but I think it is something that's a little different. We kind of work things along without allowing them to get to a real head on situation.

PK: Let's conclude today by discussing briefly the question of minorities, particularly the question of admissions [unclear].

TL: Let me do it crisply, but historically. Clearly, we had only token representation of minorities in the '60s. That was what the sit-in was largely about, to get more. The first ones we brought in a major effort, I think those blacks were of course contemporaneous with the Panthers and others. They were militants. They were the ones who were sort of blazing trail and they knew it, acted like that and were accordingly both impressive and difficult. Probably created a situation which was easier for blacks then because they could get a handle on what the issues were [unclear] than it's been at any point since. Others may disagree, but the problem developed that having gotten up to 100, the militants having passed from the scene, you began to get a kind of splintering within the minority group, as I see it in retrospect, between those who were accommodating, those who were separatists and those who felt disappointed and wanted to recreate the militant attitude.

I mention that only because I think it has been a very difficult thing because they have not had as good an acceptance and they have not felt that good about themselves. They haven't felt all of one mind, so that a little sourness crept in there, which when it became a kind of self-defense, "You people don't pay enough attention. You don't support us. You don't accept us," and that feeds on itself. Then others who are very sympathetic and who want to help, they get frustrated in how to respond to that. Then that tends to make the climate more difficult for minorities.

I think as the numbers have fallen off, this has created lots of problems which maybe have a better chance now where we have good leadership in the last couple of years. Clearly it's the outside factors now that have added a very serious dimension in the minority problem, namely that minorities do not think in terms of the higher priced institutions these days. We are no longer quite as attractive, for various reasons, which may be partly our own fault. It's getting harder and harder, as we discovered this year. We're just holding our own in minority [unclear] and I don't know how really we're going to solve this, and I'll be very blunt about it.

We have to fight the battle. We have to get more minorities. We have to try, but as I have put it bluntly to a few minority students, then the question comes do we talk those of lower quality. [unclear] measure. You can always say that of any group. You can take the bottom off and say shouldn't you take the bottom anyway, but I mean substantially different preparation, background and quality because I

don't know where we're going to find them, how many we can support, who meet our current standards.

So I see this as one of the frustrations that's going to be there with us a long time. It's one we have not been able to address all that successfully. The best one can say is that we moved, we tried and we did the right things. Not as well as we would have liked, but thank goodness we tried as much as we have because we'd be otherwise in an indefensible position.

But a lot of people jump on this one and want us to do a lot and can't understand. I've gotten to the point where one or two things must be true. Either we really don't know how to do it and others ought to enlighten us as to how to do it, or we're just going to get whip-sawed by this one and it's a no win situation, in which you know it and you just keep struggling.

But it's probably I think the most troublesome for this kind of institution because it would be easy to let yourself relax on it, since the vast majority no longer feel that strongly about it. We do not have that reservoir of indignation among whites that sustained it. It wells up at times, but this is probably the most difficult issue for anyone with a conscience in a high priced liberal arts college today. It won't appear as the most prominent issue, but it's probably the most difficult and least amenable to obvious solutions.

PK: Thank you. We'll conclude for the day.

End of Interview

PK: Continuation of interview with President Lockwood, May 14, 1981. I wanted to ask you about some questions dealing with the faculty. I think the first one I would address to you is do you sense among the faculty today differences with respect to what the faculty were like in the 1970s, thinking about some of their career expectations, how the students view faculty at this point in time. Things of that nature.

TL: I think there are a number of things one could say about it. Let me begin by saying that when I came we had, as I said before, around 121 full time faculty. Now I think we have full time faculty of about 128. We had more part time people. We have fewer part time people now. There was more turnover at that point, but still definitely enough growth around the countryside that in some fields people were fairly mobile. There was some movement. There were comings and goings.

We were also sorting out the question of really what kinds of faculty we needed. Maybe the best thing to do is to illustrate it rather quickly by a couple of cases. For example, it was clear as we decided to start a program in sociology, we needed a senior faculty member, rather than to start with a young, fresh Ph.D. We looked at a department such as political science and it was clear we needed leadership, and therefore we went out for a senior person there.

Now, both because are so much more highly tenured and because we have a pretty stable faculty at this point, we are obviously not going to be doing that sort of thing very often in the future. The kinds of changes sound minor, but probably are part of a pattern which I can describe in a moment.

We used to take more young faculty who had not finished their doctoral thesis, and I know I became persuaded that that was getting us into some problems because the demands of people's time here and the response of the typical Trinity faculty member to become sufficiently involved with the life of the campus makes it very difficult for anybody to finish a thesis simultaneously. I think we found we were doing neither us nor the individuals a good service by that. So we began to try to get out of that, as we also began to cut back on the part time--except for the sanctioned French or math, because we realized that those people were just not working. They were not as available as students, certainly in the late '60s and early '70s wanted faculty to be available to share their concerns with. In a sense, the liveliness of many of the spirits on campus in the late '60s to put a tremendous demand on faculty of a sort that is a much quieter kind now. There are students who will go and use up as much faculty time as they can get, but very often it's more in the form of being a research assistant in the chemistry department or working on the computer or helping with the English program or whatever, not the sort of large numbers wanting to sit down in the Quad and get the latest views.

I think we also, by virtue in part of the open curriculum but certainly by looking carefully at the departments, we were developing another trend which now I think is much farther down the road than we might have guessed. Namely, the expectation that our faculty be more professionally involved than they had been. The one thing you can say maybe that applies to virtually all faculty at Trinity is that somehow the atmosphere of the place convinces them to be pretty loyal, dedicated

and generally available as teachers. We have relatively few, compared to say some other institutions ours size and in our league. We have had relatively few in the past decades who were that active in their fields. Not that they weren't keeping up, it was just a matter that there was not much of a work structure, not much interest expressed here in their being involved in associations and presenting papers and all that. So that for a number of reasons now I think you would find faculty much more professionally active.

There are probably two other things, aside from the emphasis the college has brought to the publication, research and professional activity and those are that as opportunities for young faculty narrowed in the '70s, we obviously were in a buyer's market where we used not to be in the '60s. We had been able to find the best people practically in the country because this is a very desirable spot and when aren't that many openings at Harvard and so forth. These tend to be people who are much more professionally oriented, I suspect. They have learned and certainly had it drummed into them in graduate school the way you make it in the profession is to become well-known in the profession. You can give your heart and soul to a college, but don't forget that your pocketbook and future may depend also on that professional visibility.

So I think a lot of things have conspired to make it a more professionally self-conscious faculty. The open curriculum has provided in a sense an emphasis on departmental offerings, departmental development, almost departmental competition that a broad curriculum in general education tends to maybe depreciate to some extent.

I think now the atmosphere has changed. You see it in the availability of funds for research. It has been, for example, one of the important developments. We've now got money available of our own, and when you have fifty thousand dollars in the budget where we had nothing ten years ago, suddenly you are able to do things for people that tend to lead somewhere. Certainly the number of junior grants and some of the other opportunities that we've helped faculty pursue has made just more people going to Stamford and doing things that I think older faculty weren't either encouraged necessarily and probably didn't see any particular return from. Now I think there is a different attitude.

What we're trying to do, as I said the other day, is to find a better expression of that place where we are between transmitting knowledge and just doing research--maybe two extremes in an institution. We're in that middle range of institutions where you're trying to keep both things going because they are to do effective, pertinent, significant teaching about significant things, you've got to know what's significant. That's a professional obligation.

PK: Is there any truth to the assertion that one sometimes hears that over emphasis on research can detract from the quality of teaching?

TL: There are lots of mythologies in higher education and I think that's one of the favorites. I've heard it more often used as an excuse for not doing research than as a threat. It is quite clear that in my experience when a really good teacher is doing research, neither one seems to interfere with the other. They probably tend to reinforce.

There are people who you might say are good research people who can't teach--not because they're doing research, because they're

not that good at teaching. Then it's very easy to extrapolate from that and say, "Well, if you weren't doing all that research maybe you'd be a better teacher." I don't think that follows necessarily at all.

It is always a risk but I frankly think it's over emphasized more frequently as an excuse. I don't see that much evidence of it.

PK: I think a balanced view might suggest that in fact research leads to superior teaching because it tends to [unclear] one's interest, keep one abreast of current things and also that elusive quality of enthusiasm.

TL: Yes, and I think there are two or three other things that one could say in this regard. One is that at that graduate level it's essential. I mean you can't really teach effectively graduate students if you are doing nothing of your own. At the undergraduate level it is pretty difficult to find the opportunity necessarily to teach in the field you're specializing in in your research. As an historian I never had a chance to teach either Belgian history or Belgian socialism and I never will.

But I think the other thing one can say is that as a person spends more time in research, it may be too narrow to find expression except occasionally in courses. You ought to have a better feel for the whole field than you would otherwise have. It has struck me that people who have spent research in fairly narrow fields eventually get to a point where it begins to really put together a lot of other things that were kind of loosely related out there.

I think one who studies--I have to turn to history. The more you study the leftist movements in 19th and 20th century Europe, yes, you're only studying a narrow band but pretty soon it helps you understand a lot of other things that you're not reading in equal depth,

but you see how they fit in. I think that happens in most fields and that's one of the byproducts of research, both in terms of methodology and content it begins to help you get a better feel as to how you transmit to the young people, how do you get young people to understand how we go about the business of interpreting history, writing history and so forth, or what is scientific research. If you're not doing anything in science, then it seems to me it's much harder and would probably seem less valid to students to hear you talk about what scientific research is about.

PK: Do you think the various departments and faculty are balanced now, as opposed let's say to when you came to Trinity as president? Since that time any great imbalances in regard to development and ability to support the curriculum?

TL: I don't think we've ever had a problem of being badly out of balance. I think one of the limitations of the required curriculum we had in the '60s, one of its limitations, as is true of any such required curriculum, you have a commitment to a certain number of basic courses which are important and represent a significant contribution to the teaching load that does limit what else you can do. You tend to use up a lot of manpower, as we know from freshmen seminar. When you have 34 seminars that means one-sixth of 34 people's time and that was a limitation in the sense that you couldn't have quite as much richness in the number and variety of courses you offered in intermediate and advanced levels.

I think as we moved into the open curriculum, that was one of our problems. It was to sort out how much variety at what levels we

should have. I think we may have gone through some temporary imbalances which have tended to right themselves over time. The thing that has worried me most are the cross disciplinary programs. This wonderful way we distinguish between programs and departments has been a fascinating one and I don't know how widespread it is. Whenever I describe that you can't have tenure in a program and we do that deliberately so that programs can come and go as times change, but there is always a home for the faculty member in which he may get his tenure, even though he's teaching 2/3 time in American studies or intercultural studies, urban environment. That's a different arrangement, design deliberately to try to be in a position where we could keep programs going that would respond to important issues that can change over fairly long periods of time. So eventually we build ourselves some ways of adjusting as particular changes dictate. But those I do worry about because they don't have the permanency of departments.

On the other hand, I suppose one of the most controversial things, which you want to ask about later, is what happened to the education department? I think we learned that not even departments are necessarily around forever.

The imbalances that I think trouble you are not ones that you can do a great deal about in education. We don't have enough students in some of the sciences. In the 60s we had a sort of immediate post-Sputnik reaction and we built up a physics department of a certain size which was much better proportioned you might say than it had been ever in its history here at the college. Well, that was find until the

students began to taper off in the program and now we're going to let it slip one person because there just isn't at this time enough to justify a larger department.

Those kinds of shifts that you can't totally control because they represent changing student interests, those can give you some problems. You can be overstaffed in one area and understaffed, as they are in economics. I don't imagine any program in the United States has enough staff in economics these days. You're going to have those things. The real problem and this is --

[end of side 2, tape 3]

PK: Cassette 4, side A, continuation of interview with President Lockwood, May 14th, 1981. You were talking about a problem that --

TL: Yes, I was suggesting that one of the problems I think that we have and that many colleges our size will have, if any further shrinkage became desirable, that is for purposes of consolidation which would rest primarily on not allowing the quality of the student body to decline as a product of just there being fewer students, you may decide to reduce some triples to doubles and keep life a little pleasanter, but keep the quality of the student body up and just not have as many students. Then if you do some consolidation, I think the question is not going to be the one of pruning but it's going to have to be again one of perhaps we just have too many different departments and programs for this size institution. That's the dilemma, how wide a range do you need to be sufficiently attractive to meet student expectations and how much variety, in effect, dissipates your resources. How do you prevent going one way or another, that's going to be with us I think this next decade

when we're going to have really face up. I think the Curriculum Review Committee has sensed that problem, that maybe some of our programs and departments are not going to remain solid enough or are going to encounter difficulties that will require re-examination.

PK: Let me ask about this question of programs versus departments. I'm interested in the mechanisms which lead to the introduction of these. Is it a question of a certain faculty expressing an interest in this, one begins to develop it and then recruit faculty to continue, or is it a question of saying this a program we would like to have and we run out and recruit faculty?

TL: I think the interesting thing is that if I took four programs we would find that two came into being as a result of outside pressures and two came into being because of you might say internal conscious design. Maybe it would help if I just explained that. Clearly, intercultural studies was our form of response to the need to make available some courses in black history and black culture to accommodate a growing interest in Third World, Asia. We could not mount either a department or a separate program in Asian studies. We talked about it. By using a relatively large umbrella, intercultural studies, we were able to in my sense wisely avoid erecting a black studies program which we might well be dismantling, to our embarrassment, as have so many other institutions. And within that very wide one, to meet these pressures which arouse largely from developments outside. We might have gone and created an intercultural studies of some sort. There was one that was a response, trying to accommodate without committing ourselves

of building in a long-range expensive commitment that we then would have trouble getting out of.

I think the manner in which we've done that was not eminently intelligent, but that's pretty selfishly prejudiced on our part. Not everyone agreed that was the way to do it.

Urban ane environmental I think was another one, which is sort of a combination. We wanted to do something to express our conviction that we had opportunities here located in the city that we were not taking advantage of academically, but also in response to the rising interest in environmental issues, urban development. That I think therefore is mixed, maybe not entirely from outside. Of course, ironically, it's a program which is struggling because students after a flirtation with these fields have tended to back away from them when they turn out to be harder and less clearly designed and defined than some of the traditional ones.

I think the other programs that we have created were inside the college, like American studies was an outgrowth of rising interest and seeing some opportunities, and that we created from within to respond to a growing interest and growing strength in that field, which didn't divert any of our resources, exactly. We were able to just create it out of what we had, without having to develop anything further. Everyone in there has a home and was doing some other things. So in a sense we're trying to get full mileage out of it without having to spend more on it.

In going to an educational studies program we were trying to maintain a presence in a field which Trinity has had around since 1937

I guess, and yet which had declining enrollments when career opportunities for students majoring in education diminished severely, and where as happens in every liberal arts college I've ever known, this constant battle: is education really a liberal arts department or is it a vocational vestige?

PK: How was that matter approached here, both from an administrative point of view and the point of view of it relating to the curriculum? Certainly I think it spurred a lot of feelings pro and con and could this be seen as a situation that has any generalities for the future in dealing with problems of phasing out departments?

TL: It certainly was a prolonged problem. I don't know where to begin on it exactly, but let me just say a few things and you can prompt me. First, the education department here was largely linked to the graduate programs. That is, it was servicing a graduate program which had begun, once again, to shrink and the demand, the need for masters degrees among teachers in the region, as that sloped off, despite the quality of the program, it was quite clear that education was running into some troubled waters because that was largely its function. It never was a major at the undergraduate level, but they provided courses, enough courses that if somebody wanted to go on into secondary education, they could get certified relatively easily. If they wanted elementary, they had to go to St. Joseph's, and they did. Some people thought we were doing elementary but we were not and we never did.

I can well remember the conversations I had, for years it seems to me in retrospect, saying that the problem with education in liberal

arts colleges has been traditionally that they contribute nothing to how we go about teaching in colleges. That is, here is a field which talks in terms of human development and learning, teaches courses on it, presumably it ought to know how people learn. I do not know but they have been singularly unsuccessful in conveying that to their faculty colleagues almost. [tape turned off]

Well, to continue the thread. I think that failure by the department to build many bridges to other fields of inquiry at the college cost it politically. It also cost it educationally. Therefore, as we faced the problem of reducing the faculty, we really had to look at programs, as well as just marginal part time faculty where we could get a half FT here and half there, or look at physical education and some of the usual targets. As the Educational Policy Committee went about an unattractive task in which though the faculty itself had the courage to say, "Yes, we accept the responsibility for reducing ourselves"--I'll turn to that decision in a moment. Education was inevitable as a possible target. The faculty were not persuaded that it was making a substantial enough contribution, even though it felt that the presence of someone or two people in the field was important for those students who would like to take a course in philosophy and history of education or something like the psychology of human learning, that we ought to consider at least going out of a field where we had four faculty members, where we had a department, could have a long term commitment for which there was limited demand.

But as I said, I think the combination of the decline in need for people in teaching at the secondary and elementary level, that

combined with what was a degree of isolation or as Dean Rye used to put it, education was less central to our mission as a liberal arts college than other fields. That whole issue of centrality became one of the topics of debate, obviously. It is a real issue, which in some campuses has meant education never did have a departmental status.

What we learned as we went through the painful process of carving out those six FTE to get down to the 135--you remember earlier I mentioned we had a mythology about 130. We stayed at 130 for about a year and we were always over 130, but suddenly we found ourselves at 141 and knew we were running certain risks if we didn't recognize that we should hold our size faculty, since we were also in effect freezing the size of the student body.

When we looked for those six FTE and decided therefore to reduce education from a department to a program staffed by one or two people, what I felt was most important in that whole debate was the bringing the faculty into that decision. Most institutions have dealt with the problem of reduction, which all have gone through in one for or another, by allowing vacancies to revert to the university, as Yale does or some such wonderful euphemism and then just not appoint people and you recapture those FTE. I felt that was a questionable way of doing it. It could also lead to bitterness later as to "Whatever happened to those positions?" That it should be a much more self-conscious effort and the faculty, just as it made decisions as to where to add faculty, ought to be in on the recommendations as to where to cut faculty.

The process through which we went, painful as it was, I think will pay off in the long run. We've had the experience. We know how to do it. We'll do it much better next time. We will probably be politically more astute. Memories are very good in academic circles, you don't have to worry about that. My whole feeling was that we had to learn how to do it and yes, some people are going to be hurt, or feel they were hurt, but it was better than to do it in some arbitrary fashion which might have avoided some of the pain conceivably, but mostly the debate. The debate was worth it.

The one thing that I was distressed by and couldn't seem to get anybody to agree with my worry was that that it was left to one or two. Having worked our way into the position where the Educational Policy Committee report was accepted and we made these cuts, identified where they were coming from, swallowed that, then we had to appoint another committee to decide whether it would be one or two and what design that Educational Studies program would be, and I thought that was a very unwise move. I couldn't stop it and of course it meant that the debate went on for a year longer under a new guise. That I think was unfortunate. I wish that we could have avoided that because then the whole thing bubbled right up again and it got down much more to personalities than the original debate. A lot of people knew that when you said one less in physical education, all right, you start looking around to see who's going, but that was not too harsh. Nye was going to, in fact, surrender his seat when retired so there was one you got rather painlessly. We were not going to continue the college professorship that Hal Martin occupies. That was another one. Hal

retires next year, so that one was not a painful one. I think that was an unhappy decision from my point of view. I think we probably should have been tougher maybe and tried to keep a college professorship in the humanities, but we can return to that one.

But clearly when you got down to the education department and you were going to take two out of there and then you got down to where it was going to be one or two and still had three members around on campus, you got into all the stickiness we had lived through. My other comment is a rather harsh one, that it seemed to me that having risen to a certain level of statesmanship as a faculty, then at least some fell about or lost their way subsequently and couldn't keep it at that proper level. It got down to, I thought, a must unimaginative and unstatesmanlike level where we really shouldn't have been, and alas I think the residue of that may be more important than some of the agony of the theoretical discussion. That's going to take a while to wash away, the bitterness that some people developed when it seemed to really get down to personalities.

But I think it was--and I have written about this and argued with others--that we did something rather courageous and unusual. I know my colleagues at other institutions don't understand why or how we did it, and I just defend it on the grounds that I think doing it as a product of faculty responsibility and involvement ultimately is far preferable to what may be managerially easier to accomplish, and maybe even the faculty would prefer to see happen. Namely, "Oh, let the dean and president. It will cost them so many points politically. We can get rid of them time. That's a much easier route and then we don't have to

take responsibility." I think we kept their feet to the fire when a time when it certainly would have taken less time to do it some other way.

I see that as one of the most fascinating things that's happened while I was here, was to watch that process work its way through.

PK: I guess this leads naturally to the next question I would like to ask and that has to do with do you see a change in the role of the dean of the faculty in the years that you have been here? I'm suggesting that there might be the basis of discussion perhaps, two roles you might play. One would be as an advocate to faculty and the other would be a deanship active more in an administrative capacity from within the administration. Two hypothetical things.

TL: They're traditional questions. We have in a sense learned I think and could document very easily that it is not only where the emphasis lies that makes the difference, but also the style of each incumbent tends to amplify those, wherever that emphasis may lie.

If you go back historically, it seems to me that Trinity had a tradition of long-term deans until Arthur Hughs retired from the vice presidency, and there it was one who was I would say much more the monitor and guardian of faculty interests, and not necessarily one who was supposed to lead the faculty from the administration, and not too much either on the other side. It was the representative of the faculty to the administration, but it was a rather calm and I would say stepped down version of what the deanship often is in a smaller college. The dean in many smaller institutions, and I know from my own experience at Union, the dean can be almost a decentral figure. Everyone knows the president's doing lots of things and so forth, he's the senior officer,

but the dean is that very central figure in many places and very strong deans have been characteristic in many of the smaller colleges.

When Bob Fuller came in, obviously I don't know how to characterize his deanship except to say it was exciting. He was different and I think it was almost that contrast in style that left all of us a little bit confused as to where the emphasis lie with [unclear] Robert. His was much more the provocatorial role. That is, cajoling people into trying things, sometimes not all that diplomatically I suppose, but I always admired the way he just went in and tried to get people interested in trying something different and kind of dashing around with incredible energy and brilliance. He certainly was young and brilliant and brash, all things. He really stirred things up and I feel that nobody knew whether he was speaking on behalf of the faculty or whether it came from the administration or where. You just didn't know, "Where the hell was Bob Fuller operating?" I think that was really what ended up with most of us concluding that it was Bob Fuller doing his act, as much as anything, which was a very stimulating one.

He probably had closer ties with the students than any dean of the faculty I've ever known, a tremendous infiltration there. Certainly didn't hesitate to bring things as sort of a representative of the faculty to the administration, but once again, as one who was not that experienced and did not stay that long, a lot of it was simultaneous with the learning process, the mechanics of the office.

What has happened, of course, the paperwork, the nature of searches, all these things that so complicated the operation of the dean's office, that it was not at all surprising when Bob Fuller went on

to be president at Oberlein and we therefore had to look for another dean, that the committee from the faculty settled rather quickly on one of their own. I'm inclined to think that at that point it was hard to find good deans because they got so wiped out in '68-69 to '70. I mean most of the deans, if they were still alive and still around, they probably had gone back to teaching and those who thought about going into deaning wanted to wait a while and see how it settled. So they were not impressed, nor was I, with some of the people outside, but I think also we recognized and I was in agreement with the faculty committee, we wanted somebody who could bring some organization and administrative skill to what was getting to be a rather complex problem of just operating, maintaining the deans office and making sure things were in order, all the way from matters of courses and departments and operations of departments and budget and salaries and appointments because we had had to very quickly come to the question of who was tenured and tenured. A lot of the mechanics of that.

Ed Nile was quickly chosen as the person who had both the support of the faculty and everyone knew he had a very meticulous way, that he was perhaps less politically motivated than some and so on and so forth. It's quite clear what happened when Ed came in was the style changed from one that was flamboyant to one that was very even keeled, low keyed maybe in a sense and the administrative task that Ed faced was fairly immense. He sorted things out and got things in order and developed procedures that we had lacked and so forth, and therefore immediately got tagged as the "administrative type" dean who seemed to be more running the faculty and running the departments

from his office and representing the administration's view, rather than representing the faculty to the administration.

So I'm sure we shifted quite far on that side and I think the other thing was that that was a major concern of his. He was not posing as someone who had great educational dreams of what should happen in every classroom or how the programs should change and so forth. That was not where his mind went as dean and therefore that maybe both reinforced the image that the faculty had of him and also it made many faculty look to this office as the source of educational leadership.

Ed and I had a very easy working relationship there. I knew whenever I got time and got interested in some academic issue, I would not feel I was running over the dean in getting out there and getting out there and working with the faculty on education issues. It was an interesting partnership and maybe that tended to reinforce the view that he was more administrative than a member of the faculty.

When Ed retired from that position and we then went out for a search again, it was interesting that the faculty were looking for an academic leader type. Not that they hadn't always wanted that, but they wanted somebody who would be a well established teacher, scholar who they could hope would represent their interests more explicitly than Ed had.

So the emphasis has begun to shift back over into someone who works with the faculty on their concerns and the rising support for research, all the things that Andrew's been doing, I think are illustrative of that shift again back to a position where he's more of a dean of the faculty who is working on faculty matters on behalf of the faculty, less

an administrative, but of course you can't cut it that cleanly. So that we've gone through three quite different styles in the dean's office.

PK: The way you describe it, it's clear that the individual really plays a very central role in shaping that office.

TL: Oh, yes.

PK: It's highly a personal sense of what can be done with the office.

TL: Yes, and I think two other things I would say about the position of dean of the faculty that may stand up or may be proven inappropriate. First, I think the dean of the faculty always used to be sort of the senior officer after the president in terms of administrative responsibility within small colleges, and that if the president were ill or had gone mountain climbing or anything like that, why, obviously the dean was the person who ran the place. That was still possible in the '60s. I would say it hasn't been a standard feature or possibility in most colleges since 1970, roughly. The demands upon his time from faculty, the changing situation among the faculty, the dean has to spend just too much time on those matters and most institutions would back up a president in terms of a second in command with a vice president from some other area. In our case Tom Smith was--I felt we had to have another person and Tom served as the vice president, undesignated as the senior officer until Jim English came in, where his sense of style and experience made it possible for him to deal with the managerial questions in the president's office and know their fiscal implications, all that sort of thing, so that he was much more sensible to move in that direction.

I think other institutions have had comparable experience where the dean of the faculty is not necessarily the most senior officer of the college under the president, and I think that will persist for a while at least.

PK: Let's move now, if we may, to the question of tenure, which I think is one of central interest and clearly critical to the college today and in fact to the whole future of graduate education, really. Firstly, perhaps you could explain the whole process of tenure that we have had at Trinity and the various procedures that have followed the process of tenure.

TL: Some of these questions I thought could have gone on for hours. I'm sure this one can. [laughs] First, a historical note. Trinity traditionally granted tenure only to full professors and full professors were chosen by full professors. When you became one, you got tenure and when I came that was the only reference I found to tenure in our letters.

PK: In other words, the other members of the faculty did not enjoy tenure in the system in the '60s.

TL: Well, as they said, they didn't have dejouree tenure, they just had a defacto and that was very confusing because when I went through, I discovered that we had held to that pretty much. We didn't say anything about it in letters to associate professors who had been here for years and years and years. One of the things that people forget and it's always confused in faculty at time, the salary letter in most independent institutions is not the contract letter. It is merely a salary letter. Whereas, in public institutions a salary letter is a contract letter, and the difference is important because what we did was issued annual

or in some cases every other year salary letters for the next two years. Since many institutions didn't change their--or only changed, say, Trinity had a practice of giving salary raises only every other year, half the faculty got them each year.

So that was a contract letter and in some of those contract letters we would say "for the next five years," or something like that, because the normal length of contract for an associate professor is five years and assistant professor is two or three. We had a faculty, and strangely enough I was astonished that the faculty had not fought this issue out earlier, which is an indication once again of their goodwill, but also their trust in the administration over the years. They felt there was not any threat to them and eventually they'd get the equivalent or actual tenure.

In trying to clarify the grounds on which tenure and promotion would be granted, and therefore by implication the grounds on which we could separate people, I decided we better clarify the tenure situation and that we were implicitly operating according to the AAUP standards, namely seven years of continuous employment at full time entitled one to tenure or some decision on it. We were operating on that basis, but we just didn't acknowledge it. So one of the first tasks was to clarify and that was the great blanketing in of a lot of people who had been here 15, 20 and in one case 28 years as an associate professor without tenure. Well, we were obviously never going to ask the person to leave and we had no grounds anyway, and because we were so stingy with full professorships, that is you could get into a

department that was kind of clogged and then you could sit for a long while at the associate professor.

So we blanketed in everybody who was entitled under AAUP standards to tenure. I thought and still maintain that was a wise thing to do. I think some people would say now, well, of course, if you didn't have it you could pull a fast one and you could ask somebody to leave by not renewing your contract. Just say, "Well, sorry, you don't have tenure." I think that's naive, would have been lacking in compassion and would have led to a lot of challenges, anyway.

What we did then was to work through with the faculty the standards according to which we would make decisions of tenure.

PK: What are those standards?

TL: The standards are largely those that--and they apply to promotion also. That is that the person must be a successful teacher or as we say optimistically, "An outstanding teacher in the classroom." The person must have established himself as a mature scholar in his field, recognized by others as a scholar in that field. That is also a way of saying the person must be professionally engaged and alert and informed. Third, must have made conspicuous service to the college. Usually they've been taken in that order. That is, heaviest emphasis is on the teaching ability, somehow measured. We get evidence and it is evaluated in some fashion and then the next level of importance is that of scholarship. There must be some evidence of, it isn't publications it's in active work or papers or presentations or whatever. There has got to be concrete evidence the person has been doing some significant work in the field, and that he is known somewhere. I don't mean to be

captious in this, but obviously you know that's been an area of controversy, how you evaluate that scholarship. Is it significant or must it be as significant as what they would expect at Harvard and so forth. We as academics can debate that one endlessly and generally do.

The third one is one which people kind of say, "Oh, well, that means you've got to be on a committee or two," but we do mean more than that. The person has to provide some [unclear] to the whole community. That is, that the person should meet with others of the faculty and should contribute to their intellectual enrichment and should be a good colleague. There are lots of ways we try to express that more explicitly and that one in many instances is important.

What happens in the process is the department meets and those on tenure at some point have been forewarned when they must make a recommendation whether an untenured colleague they would argue should now be tenured. The department develops that case and prepares the paperwork and develops in effect a dossier which used to be pretty thin. Now we get it usually and it's quite a few inches. It has grown.

The labor that the A&P Committee must go through in the review of tenure, as we have refined the process, the paperwork has grown immensely. It used to be a rather casual procedure and we kept hammering at getting more information and we've I think improved that greatly that process. The compliments I pay to the members, particularly the faculty members of that A&P Committee I think have served their colleagues very well indeed. It's an unattractive post in

many ways, requires an awful lot of time and good judgment. I think it's working superbly here at Trinity. That isn't to say the judgments are all right. We've made mistakes, but I think as a process it's worked and the faculty commitment to it is very admirable.

The department recommendation comes to the dean. The dean makes sure--we have a regular check list--that everything and all of the papers, all the material is there. He assembles it and then we look at all tenure cases one by one and then we look at them collectively and we work our way through and debate, review and decide whether or not to support the recommendation of the department.

Assuming for the moment that the recommendation was an affirmative vote by the committee, because interestingly enough if there is not an affirmative vote, we don't vote somebody down. We just say it failed for lack of a vote and I've always thought that was a kind of important distinction which usually takes a faculty member two years or so after being on the committee to agree on that. It's kind of one of those little things that I guess I've always felt at this kind of institution we ought to be conscious about style and that's an important stylistic point. You don't vote people down, but you just merely indicate that at this point in time, particularly say in promoting to full professor, at this point in time the committee does not feel the case merits a permanent vote. We don't say "you're no good" by a negative vote.

Then it goes to the Joint Education and Policy Committee, which then brings three trustee members in and there it is to review just whether we've put together a reasonably solid case. If when we prepare that paper for them and present the case to the trustee

members, if we look at them and say, "Oh, my, that really isn't very good research," or, "There isn't much evidence for his being a good teacher," or whatever. That's really their function is to see whether we've got a really good case. If we can present a plausible and persuasive case, then it goes onto the board and the board votes whether or not to award tenure.

Obviously, there have been two or three hidden questions that will always be there. There is no way to disarm suspicion and there's no definitive answer. One is is there a kind of a quota? Is it theoretically possible that if everybody was eligible and qualified for tenure, would we tenure everybody? My answer is very explicit on that, but it's an unaccepted one and therefore it is not accepted. Namely, I say, "No!" That doesn't solve that question very easily.

The second one of course is are there structural considerations. That is, distribution by rank, by age. Do we take these into account and as you know, we've had various committees review that, put paranthesis around "except where there are exceptional structural considerations," and then we've removed parenthesis. Then we've decided that it's all right if there are structural reasons, as long as the department knows a year or in advance. We've thrashed on that one and I worry less and less about our thrashing, as long as everybody realizes that there may well be structural considerations that will matter and the committee knows from me, as the one person who has sat on the committee the entire time and as the only history of the committee and that experience, that I have invoked them and I will always say it very openly. But no committee wants to go to the public, as it were,

out of private session to the public and say, "Well, for structural reasons we didn't vote this way." So that's one out there.

I think the third thing is just how do the standards keep changing. If there's anything that others have complained to us about, "Oh, you keep changing the standards." It's sort of like the--and I often say this--"You sound like an alumnus who says, 'I couldn't get into college now, your standards are too high, and therefore they're unreasonable when you reject my son. My son could have gotten in when I got in,'" and that's the way some faculty respond on this one. I say, "I don't understand that. What you're saying is we never should improve ourselves."

You can imagine, you don't close that argument out by anything you can say, but it is true here that we have obviously raised the level of expectation. Yes, we have been tougher. That isn't to say we're always consistently tougher, but I think market conditions tend to change how you look at it. If we have such a scarcity of faculty out there that we knew we couldn't have an English department unless we took in some clunkers, I suppose we'd take in clunkers. To put it that crudely, you're going to make those adjustments and now we're at a point where we can be tough, but also I think we have committed ourselves to saying, "Do we want to be first rate?"

This brings me back to one of the things I said in one of our earliest discussions. It has taken all of my time to get to the point that we are now at, where nobody dares say, "Look, you can't ask us to meet Amherst standards." I think now everyone realizes in the faculty that either in committee or on the floor of the faculty, if somebody

dares get up and say that, I'll chop their head off. It's just not any longer acceptable, and they've bought it. I think they've bought it basically, but boy that has taken a long time!

It showed up in those appointments and promotions committee discussions. Whenever we had a disagreement about people, it often came down, "Well, you're setting standards that are Amherst's or Harvard's," and I'd say, "Harvard, university standards differ. They have differ functions and different responsibilities, but for instance Amherst, we ought to have every bit as good a faculty, if not better." Why not? Why shouldn't we be better? But in any case, to say we have the standards of Susquehanna and not Amherst...

I think these are some of the subtle questions and subtle changes that I hope have occurred over the last decade because it's been sort of the one little hurdle--not so little--the college has had to make to come into its own and recognize its strength and its very high standard. You can be an institution of high standing and not recognize it and act as though you were and we've had a little bit of that. This is where it often came out, was right in those appointment and promotion discussions.

PK: I recall seeing a report, I think it was from the dean's office, some years ago that forecast the retirement figures and the number of senior faculty and tenure. When it comes to a question of granting tenure and/or promotion, clearly I would suspect the criterion of how many members of that department are already --

[end of side 1, tape 4]

TL: --lead to a position that no department should be fully tenured, primarily because I have felt that changes do occur in fields and where you once wanted two solid state physicists, you may want only one and you may suddenly want a master physicist that you hadn't thought of five years earlier. Yet, I think that despite statistics, which sure got thrown around for a few years, we probably can still maintain enough turnover so we don't build in obsolescence or get really in the dangerous position of being over tenured. Now let me go back to some particulars here.

As we are able to attract very much longer faculty than we might have anticipated say as we entered the '70s--we did pick up some very, very able people. Once again the irony being in some instances, "Well, if you don't give this person tenure, you shouldn't have given me tenure." Some of the department chairman were very open about that. One of my favorite phrases, John Milnor always kids me about. He said, "When I became chairman I remember what you said, I was supposed to get faculty all of whom were better than I. I've done it. Now what are you going to do about it?" [laughs] I think we found ourselves getting a bit caught by our own efforts here and it seemed that if one looked back, enough things happened all the way from the sad fact of death unexpectedly to people moving to other positions or developing interests which suddenly took them away from the academic world, that you could make a case that even though that statistic you quote of Eds that showed me if we tenured everybody who was coming on stream in tenure track positions, we would end up 90% tenured at a peak and then retirements would start to have their effect,

that maybe we wouldn't run as much of a risk in that loss of flexibility as those statistics would suggest. Therefore, even though it has been a factor and certainly a concern of mine as we've moved along, we haven't been as harsh on that score as I would have preferred or originally thought we would be.

Now I probably I am getting soft but I think I see another reason why that isn't all that bad. Today's graduate students are not as good. It is quite clear that those now entering graduate schools are far less able than the people who entered them in the late '60s and early '70s. I've heard more graduate deans, department heads at universities say this and it's very discouraging. If you stop to think of it, it's not unreasonable because a lot of bright people are looking around saying, "Look, there aren't going to be jobs. I can have an interesting life and make some money doing something else, and I'm not going to go be a history professor and end up having to scrape along until I can find a job." So we are losing in the academic world and it's very much of a worry for all of us, that able person who used to think of the academic profession as a very worthy one to join. So we may be forced into keeping some of these younger people around on tenure, rather than having gotten rid of them because in a short time we might find their replacements less able.

Also, I think it does vary from field to field and I think what we're watching more carefully now is not so much classics who are fully tenured, but we always know we're going to have three people in classics. This would take horrible times for us to have cut back. Biology probably there's enough mobility there that we don't worry that

that's now fully tenured. I think where it gets tougher is when you turn to a field like philosophy where we just don't know whether we can sustain 5 2/3 people in philosophy. We have also a very funny age distribution--all the senior members are all the same age and they have been ever since Blancher Means brought them in. They were all quite literally within two years of each other. There you've got a touchier problem because perceptively the retirements aren't there.

Now, in a recent study we did of the 63 people who are age 55 or older in our faculty, 44 of those have been here long enough that they would be eligible for our new early retirement plan. That says something. If you take then the 19 who aren't eligible yet because they haven't been with us long enough, that suggests we have brought in some senior people to fill gaps and so forth and we will probably have to do that in ways that you wouldn't assume if you think everybody's going to get tenured and we're going to be all clogged up.

I may have lost the thread of this argument a little bit, but in some sense it's a more complex issue than if you just look at the figures starkly because there are lots of other factors. On the one side I think there is more movement than you might think in our so-called steady condition these days. On the other side, the thing that's coming in that may make everything, my optimism totally unfounded, is if social security eligibility goes up to 68. Now, obviously, you don't have to retire until 70. We can't force anybody to retire, except if they fall apart, and we can't make early retirement attractive enough and inflation continues. You put enough of these things together and it may be that we'll all stay around forever. [laughs] In which case, yes, quite

literally the faculty is getting older and a funny statistic in that regard is they're getting older about five years for every ten years that passes, as the average age of the faculty goes up that much in ten years. It is five years older as a whole, because you just don't have enough people coming in and enough old people going out. That's what happens, it gets to be an older and older faculty.

One can argue, sit here and talk about it and speculate wonder that will a graying faculty retain its ability to relate effectively with young people because our students don't change in age. I guess we have never known and couldn't document anyway, how important it has been to have a lot of young faculty who may have an easier time relating to students, rather than have most of our faculty at least the age of their fathers and maybe in a few cases their grandfathers.

This whole thing is going to be fascinating to watch develop because I suppose we've just got a new series of factors that could influence the whole question of tenure and longevity and continuity in ways that were never quite anticipated when tenure was introduced way back in 1913 and became sort of formalized in the famous AAUP statement on tenure in 1940.

PK: Do you think nationally that tenure has had a negative impact on the expectations of younger faculty? Has higher education produced a generation of people [unclear] because of the tenure situation?

TL: I hadn't thought of it in those terms, Peter, and never have. I guess maybe I'm puzzled why I haven't, but let me try and see if I can understand why I haven't. First, I think the young person looks at this as a kind of rite of passage. That is, having finally sweated out the

Ph.D., which we still require, then enters the profession and clearly the last sort of hurdle to getting the mantle is that tenure decision. I think most faculty, young faculty still remain pretty optimistic that they will get tenure at their first shot or certainly not later than their second shot.

Despite the very heavy burden on them of getting ready for tenure, and it is a lot of pressure on them because they don't know how good their chances are in a place like Trinity, although if they looked at it historically they'd have to be pretty encouraged. We don't say no to all that many, but they've already made one decision in accepting an appointment at Trinity that they're not going to hold out for an opportunity to try to get tenure at Harvard. They have chosen this rank at the best colleges, as opposed to the best universities. They've said, "Okay, I'm most likely to succeed and my interests lie in the best colleges." Now, they can step back and then say, "Well, I'll try the next level and I think they may not be do it quite as self-consciously as that implies, but that is the way that they look at it.

It takes a toll in terms of their concentration and their self-assurance and competence during their first years of teaching. It is a terrible burden, and in a sense I guess this is why I didn't look at it as your question posed it. I look at it as rather that's the penalty we pay by having a tenure system, in a sense we demand a lot in a way that is somewhat traumatic and then we reward them in a way that provides a security that's unusual compared to other professions. I think a lot of people recognize that you can't have that security without having to pay a price earlier.

PK: Of high risk.

TL: Of high risk, yes. How many are just out there floating I don't know. I think it is interesting that every national association that I am aware of now has workshops on alternatives to an academic career. So obviously now we are trying to help the person who finds this isn't the niche, to have them help them individually cope with the fact that it may not be a failure individually, but rather they really haven't found yet what they are best at or can do most effectively.

The real price that you always pay in education, two costs that I guess we have to bear--one cost is that we ask for people to defer getting into an income producing situation for quite a while. Going to graduate school in the first place is an expense, a burden, and sometimes that goes on for years and years in a way that virtually no other profession except medicine requires. Law is three years, basically; medicine can be four to five. We end up asking the same thing with absolutely no particular guarantee with having sacrificed, as it were, to build up that professional background, that there's going to be much of an opportunity afterwards. Whereas, doctors and lawyers so far have been pretty sure they were going to do pretty well. Now, that may change in those professions, but certainly that has been a cost to us, that deferment of getting into an income producing position.

I think the other cost obviously has been that we have developed a security system that we've paid for in the sense that some people quite literally do burn out or something happens and we carry them. Whenever I'm asked by a corporate person or someone else out there not in the academic world, "How can you possibly have tenure? What do you do? How do you get rid of the dead wood?" and all these

clichés. I have changed my answer to saying it is one of the costs we are willing to bear in order go guarantee that we have the political freedom and the kind of assurance that the faculty may pursue the truth wherever it may lie, and that we give them a kind of reward for their long sacrifice before they get tenure.

I don't know how that washes as an answer, but I think it is a statement of the case and even though you'd like to say, "Well, we don't have vice presidents of nothing to which we can send these people." [laughs]

Obviously, this is a cost we bear and I'm still persuaded that the other way of looking at tenure is an answer I've given to say those few trustees who keep wondering why the academic world insists on tenure. If we didn't have tenure, we'd have unions. We have enough--15 to 20% of the faculties in this country are now unionized and I don't see any difference. As a matter of fact, I think it's worse because probably it means that once you join the union and get on the campus, all it is is sheer seniority. You can't really not give tenure, or if you don't have tenure what you're doing is as long as they're good members of the union, they're going to be on your teaching staff. You're not going to get rid of them any more easily than you do a tenured faculty member. Your procedures are far less attractive and far less under the control of the faculty themselves. This has always been my main argument in this whole [unclear] some years ago and persists. It's not in the faculty's best interest because they will lose control over lots of things they now play an important part in determining.

PK: In a sense it's a monolithic approach to dealing with some of these [unclear]. Individual members [unclear], or as you say the personal aspect is [unclear].

TL: And I think one of the things that I suppose as president you feel disappointed and a little depressed about until you realize how silly it is, you can within this structure do so many things for individual faculty and it's one of the pleasures of what is I think a very pleasant profession, basically. Despite ugliness at times and all the problems that we sometimes magnify into real problems, this is a very good life people lead. It's not as economically rewarding as some professions, true, but it is a very attractive way of life. We are able to work together with people in a very comfortable way for the most part and you can help individual faculty. When you get a sticky-wicket, an agitator or whatever it is, you get stuck with it and you do it. I suppose that's why I get so discouraged when they talk about, "them, the administrators" as if we were a bunch of gorillas over here who never had a brilliant idea in the first place, but obviously act inhumanely at times.

I'm exaggerating, but I suppose you're disappointed that it isn't recognized more often, but what you do with individuals you do quietly and you don't ask to be repaid, but you wish sometimes people would remember that there isn't that much of a gulf between faculty and administration. All we've done is divide up the chore of running an educational institution. They have their primary function and those of us in administration have ours and sure, at times they don't quite knit as nicely as people would prefer, but we're serving their needs and they're

serving our needs as an institution. We just have to divide up the labor and in the process of doing that, unhappily some of these I think very pleasant human relations and helping hand functions and so forth get lost.

PK: Let me wrap up the question of tenure by asking if tenure can on occasion create rifts between the junior and senior faculty? Is there a possibly of that happening?

TL: Did you say rifts?

PK: Rifts, rives between the two groups, and does that have anything to do with a tendency on the part of established faculty perhaps to as time moves by become more conservative in their views?

TL: I think there are a number of elements that it tends to exacerbate. When the guild operated and full professors chose their colleagues, I suppose on the one hand at that time--and I know this from my father's experience--that they were willing to make harsher judgments. That may seem that that was better than now when we hesitate now to be unresponsive to junior colleagues. At the same time, it was such a cozy league that they tended to perpetuate their own kind and often it was not a matter of talent, it was whether they didn't like the person . If he didn't make that good an impression on the full professors, he was not elected to full professorship. I think now we do it on much more objective grounds and therefore the risk of a rift is less pronounced than it was.

On the other hand, the thing that operates inevitably in this now litigious age is that people don't want to make unfriendly judgments, for fear one that they may end up in court, but more important that they

may be the person who says that unkind word that ruins the person's career. The young person out didn't get tenure, doesn't get reappointed because I was skeptical of their ability and so forth. I think it has hurt relations between younger and older faculty because some older faculty don't want to get too close to them because they'll be put in that judgmental role and they don't want to say, "Oh, well, despite all the drinks we've had together, I think you aren't that good." A lot of those things have gotten to be harder to handle. I know the dean and I often are saying to chairmen, "Help the young faculty. Remember, the young faculty member hasn't had any experience. You've had it. Put a good arm around the shoulder. Help a little bit. Explain, bring along, but of course also evaluate," and that's the tough. Sometimes people have trouble handling those two roles and I think young faculty tend to cluster among themselves and say, "We're all paranoia ridden, so why don't we join together and enjoy our misery because they will never understand. They've forgotten how it is." I think a lot more of that is going on than used to.

Peter, this is something before I forget it I want to throw it in and then you can decide whether to pick up and return to this. I am not sure the source of it is necessarily as a result of how hard it is maybe to get tenure or the process of getting tenure and getting promoted and so forth that it's tended to heighten some of these tensions you're asking about. I think it may lie in a much more pervasive and unattractive development I see in higher education, maybe in other fields as well, maybe in society as a whole. Namely, the rising distrust.

I think the thing that I have been most discouraged when I am discouraged as president, I can't believe the interpretations given to some statements I make or someone else makes. That people could read into them or understand them in the ways they tell me later, and the only comfort I take is they must be playing a political game. I say something that is very clear in my mind and I thought answered the questions and they've read it and they can read into it all sorts of ominous signs. I said, "Well, they must be doing that because now they're going to come back and ask something else, and therefore this is the new political way of life we must become accustomed to."

I guess I'm forced to believe now that it is just that there is more distrust out there of colleagues and everyone.

PK: I think it's the society. A bond of trust that used to exist, I think one sees it even in regard to [unclear]. There are those that represent [unclear] That whole sense of trust seems to have broken down, certainly it's eroded. I see this [unclear].

TL: You do reinforce my own view and as I say, it's one I wanted to mention. I never had that experience when I entered the profession and I always felt that one of the engaging features of the academic community was that we did trust one another. We might not even like one another that much, but we did basically trust. We had nothing to gain. It's a not-for-profit organization. Nobody's trying to make a fast buck. We weren't concocting sleazy deals all over the place. Most of it was in the open. There may have been a failure to tell people. There may have been errors in judgment, all that sort of thing. We all make mistakes, but we were all willing to accept all that as not a

manifestation of mistrust, but just as sloppiness or whatever term might emerge.

Now I think no matter whether it's good or bad, you encounter this distrust. I think that's part of what you were asking earlier, this feeling about younger and older faculty. I think there is that working as well as the situation itself.

PK: Let's conclude today with the background of some of this. I think you mentioned this before, that you found coming to the presidency of Trinity that the faculty had not worked out details and implications of tenure on a consistent basis. This raises it seems to me a larger question of the willingness of faculty to band together and to exercise a certain amount of power from their own responsibility. How do you see this at Trinity? Has the faculty been willing to take responsibility for not necessarily its actions, but for making judgments on certain critical issues that deal with [unclear]. You mentioned the education department. It was almost a process of having to force that.

TL: I find I'm very divided in my opinion. On the one hand, the Trinity faculty is surprisingly unaggressive. I think of many other faculties that band together and are quite used to really running their affairs or trying to run lots of things and asserting themselves much more than our faculty ever has. Now, that often is in self defense. It is to protect turf. It is not necessarily on behalf of the institution.

I've always been the first to compliment our faculty on the fact that very often I see their position in this regard as one of loyalty to the institution, a kind of feeling for the institution, which may have diminished over time. The climate has changed, but still there's enough

there that they do think in collegial terms and you can bring them to accept that responsibility as in the case of cutting faculty. That isn't just defensive of their interests or making sure they have their rights guaranteed.

The absence of strong leadership in the faculty probably accounts for it as much as anything in my judgment, Peter.

End of Interview

Continuation of interview with President Lockwood, May 18, 1981.

PK: Question of the faculty.

TL: And I was saying something about leadership. I think one of the things that happens in smaller colleges, you have peaks and troughs in faculty leadership and I think we have been missing over the last five years at least and maybe earlier the leadership of senior statesmen within the faculty. We had them initially, mainly those who had come either just before or right after the war. When that group began to retire, we really were left with very few who could provide that kind of seasoned experience in guiding the faculty to whatever position they thought was both proper and then had to correctly modulate it so that it achieved their purposes without alienating others. I think that was partly the product of disarray caused by the student concerns of the late '60s and early '70s, some of which was almost a conscious withdrawal by some senior faculty in the face of what they've sometimes quite openly considered to be a somewhat ill-mannered younger faculty or at least faculty who were approaching life differently, however brazen.

We have had very few of those people step forward and bring the faculty along. If you stand in front of the faculty meetings, you know in a sense you have a group on the right who represent some of the more conservative older guard and then on the left you have more of a blend. I think that in itself reflects a little bit of what has happened, it isn't that the senior faculty sit with their department members, they send a cluster depending on their orientation.

I think in this regard, to return to a topic that we chatted about a little bit, mainly the element of distrust that maybe has permeated higher education, as much of other life. There I think has been in faculty discussions an open relegation, a kind of distrust of what the older politicos may be up to on the part of younger members, and a distrust on the part of some of the senior members of the faculty of the motives behind the particular points of view of younger faculty. That makes it more difficult for a faculty--to return to your question--more difficult for a faculty to pull together and take a position as clearly and aggressively, if you wish, to protect its own interest or present its own point of view.

But I would say that in contrast to many institutions and the traditional ones like Oberlein or Swathmore, those two where the faculty have exercised great influence, that Trinity's faculty have tended to act more quietly. Another thing that reinforces that generalization, and it's a fair one, is that very often we do things once again by working with an ad hoc committee and Al Jacobs did this a great deal, meeting informally, working out some of the things that may come up so that the faculty contribution is less visible and it's picked up in these informal settings and some sort of adjustment is made outside the formal political processes. I think that sort of goes hand-in-hand with the style that we were talking about earlier. It may be simply a matter of diffusing or it may be anticipating things on time or something, whatever it may add up to.

You put these together and the faculty have been concerned about their well-being and their position in the life of the college, but

not as aggressive or obstreperous about it as many that you either hear about, probably in the form of rumor, or know have a stronger tradition of faculty leadership.

PK: Have the standing committees of the faculty continued to make major contributions, or do you think the ad hoc committees have arisen to address specific problems?

TL: I think you've had two, possibly three committees that have evolved very impressively over time--slowly, admittedlyand those are the Appointments and Promotions Committee, the Educational Policy Committee and most recently the Curriculum Committee, and those are where the important issues are resolved and much of the business of the faculty occurs.

I think the efforts of the other committees have been sort of modest. The Academic Affairs Committee does its business and doesn't get accolades anyway. That's fine. It's been astonishing to me that it took so long and it's taken so much effort upon my part and on other's to get an Admissions Committee going. It's beginning to function. I can't imagine a faculty that would wait so long as the Trinity faculty did to create an Admissions Committee. In a sense it's a compliment to the administration. On the other hand, you could argue that it was a little lagardly on the part of the faculty.

The committee structure I think has been a disappointment to everyone, faculty and administration alike. We've had too many committees. We've gone through periodic attempts to prune. Some faculty members are loath to join committees. I think it is always a good topic like advising, it needs perpetual improvement.

Let me back up and make two corrections I think. One certainly is that the Financial Affairs Committee, which I was insistent we have one, has grown once again and has begun to make I think contributions to the budget process and involved the faculty. I think that was an important step, to at least have some faculty who became knowledgeable about the budget and budget making process. I think the most recent committee that was created, the Committee on Administration, in its own quiet way is helping us immensely but that's one of the ones again that a few people are interested in. They're good loyal souls who will help you and act in an advisory capacity, and that has taken off very well, also. So I guess I'd have to augment it by those two committees.

There is one other historical fact that I think is well to get down because I'm sure it may otherwise be lost. When I first came and when Bob Fuller became dean, the faculty secretary, which had always been sort of a traditional post at Trinity, held by people like Larry Tole for years and years and years and years, was seized on as now having some political significance. That has ebbed and flowed throughout my administration as to whether that was a prominent political force in the faculty and the secretary ought to have a lot more role than that of the traditional secretary. That, as I say, has changed as times and people have changed the position.

But when we started off in '68 there was a feeling on the part of some faculty that Dean Fuller was going to be very aggressive and that also the president was going to push through a lot of things and therefore there should be some way to slow it or have an [unclear] if

necessary, and I'm putting it rather bluntly because I remember conversations about it. That was when the Faculty Conference was created and it was created explicitly as a political body, a small body within the college.

I remember arguing with Rex Neverson as to, "Well, if you're going to do that, why don't you have a senate or have a small body of faculty as almost an executive committee to the faculty who could carry out its business in between meetings or the kinds of things that meetings, plenary sessions do not lend themselves to." No, they decided to create this Faculty Conference, which was presumably to help organize the business of the faculty, but its intent was quite clear. It was a political body which would rally or guide the faculty in whatever way it saw proper and to be sort of a watchdog for the faculty against what they saw as a fast changing science with a particularly aggressive dean.

That Faculty Conference once again is still with us and performs a function that has softened over time, and it's now I think safe to say plays only a mild political role and probably has helped organize the business where committees have not been as effective.

PK: Let's move onto the question of students at Trinity and perhaps you could give me your perspective on how we feel we stand now in attracting good students. The base of our admissions area on which we draw, is that--just the general quality of the student body that we're attracting.

TL: That's an interesting blend of questions. Maybe start with the geography first because that in a sense puts it in a kind of perspective.

I think it is accurate to say that Trinity became a national institution with respect to [unclear] at least during the early '60s. It was then that we were reaching out into areas we had not had much success with in the past. It was also a time when students tended to come from longer distances to private colleges and places like Dartmouth boasted of having at least one student from every state in the union.

As costs rose and as higher education grew, one of the facts that emerged and I know struck me early in the '70s was that 85% of all students in America at that time went to college within 250 miles of home. Part of that was the growth of community colleges. So what we knew also was beginning to show up, our concentration in New England and Middle Atlantic states was frightening. Philadelphia became the single most important source of students in the '70s. They fed--I mean students from Philadelphia came here and told other friends and there sort of was a multiplier effect there.

But it was also clear that we were not and never have gotten students out of the south whatsoever, except for a few places such as New Orleans or transplants from Florida and so forth. West of the Mississippi, a Harvard study done in the '60s indicated clearly that Harvard even, when it went west of the Mississippi the net effect was almost 50% of the costs had to be borne by the university. You had to find financial aid students or needy students and attract them. You were not getting that many full paying students. A more recent study by the Consortium on Higher Education indicates that even in that group of the 30 most distinguished colleges and universities, no one of those institutions depends on more than five states for a majority of the

students. Harvard, Chicago and so forth. We do not, any of us, reach out that far. So that when you see that we have representatives from 32 states, it still means we get Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and New York are the five states that represent well over the majority of our students. Washington DC, Illinois, there are pockets all around, but basically that's where we draw our students.

I don't think you can expect to break that concentration. These are the areas where both we are best known, but I think also where because they are not that far away, we will most easily get students. It's only as you develop fairly significant alumni connections in a city like Atlanta, can you begin to get maybe some students. But they will always be small numbers, compared to the concentration coming out of the five states I mentioned.

We are in a very intense competition because one of the ironies almost of moving from a college which was rather worried about ever being able to compete with the best, with the Ivy League and maybe with Amherst and Williams and so forth, as it began to compete and as we saw that we were having greater and greater overlap with those institutions, in a sense we were entering a stiffer competitive league, namely the best league there is. Fascinating to me has been the fact that generally Brown is the institution with which we have the greatest overlap and we can't win a majority of the students. When those two institutions offer admission, we know we're not going to get a majority in that case. So in a sense we are now in the toughest competitive market and that makes it harder and harder to recruit the very best, as

those institutions tend to lower their standards--whatever phrase they may use.

[end of tape 4, side 2]

PK: A continuation of interview with President Lockwood, May 18th, 1981. We're talking about the students at Trinity, and perhaps now you might characterize the kinds of students that we seem to be attracting. Is it a diverse group? What about their expectations?

TL: It is not as diverse a group as we used to attract. I think that has happened here and elsewhere because of inflation, rising costs. Most of the financial aid that is available either through federal or our own funds tends to make best sense to someone with substantial need rather than some with honest need and therefore it is true that the classic observation has applied to some extent here, namely that the middle class has been cut out of the higher priced independent colleges and they're the ones who are going primarily to public institutions.

So we tend to have a bit of a polarization between those with substantial need and those with either very little need or considerable means. Certainly any study I know of for Trinity or any other college like us shows the average family income of students who are attending college has risen impossibly, I suppose to the delight of the fund-raisers. That clearly has been skewed because of costs into a group of students 75% of whom have until maybe just this last couple of years where we've been able to get up to maybe 30% on financial aid, but basically 3/4 of the students are paying now prospectively about $10,000 a year. That I think will limit the diversity.

The one shift that has occurred has been a modest increase in the number of those coming from public school versus those coming from private independent academies, but even then we're talking about 40% roughly of our students coming from independent schools, which tends to tailor them for this kind of institution, and they tend to be more alike than less alike.

I think we attract an able student who has a good academic record. Statistics would bear out that have done well in school, many of them working pretty much to the top of their ability. We get fewer geniuses who have been loafing and we get a lot of conscientious very good students. I always hate to scale these because I really don't know what that means, but I think what does to some extent distinguish our students is these are students for the most part who are also interested in participating in other things on campus, be it the radio station, athletics, whatever. I think we attract a student who wants to continue to be able to do that, as opposed to someone who says, "I'm going to a university and I'm not going to be able to do it. It's too professional in all those outfits and I will be just doing my studies and enjoying life on a big campus." We get people who look forward to continuing to be active and therefore probably that brings a greater homogeneity by selection.

Therefore, I think those who have been concerned about the diversity of student body, whether it's minorities or whether they're talking about hungry, less affluent students of any ilk, it's going to be difficult. I think we face a situation not unlike preparatory school itself. We are going to be catering to a certain band of society

primarily, partly because of our pricing and partly because of our tradition. I think it is hard to and you're reluctant to move away from a group of people throughout a lot of suburbs in America who like this kind of educational experience for their children, and as we've often said, there are a lot of other probably very deserving young people out in all sorts of towns in the middle of Iowa who just don't know and for whom this would be such an unfamiliar thing that it's very hard to persuade them. We know that from the down state experience and a lot more. You offer them a wonderful alumni scholarship, but you're asking a student for whom a localized eastern college, if he visits here, it's quite a shock. It's quite different from the Peoria High School and therefore is not sure how happy he or she will be.

You asked about expectation. Did you mean expectations on our part or on their part?

PK: On their part and ours, too.

TL: I think students come here with the expectation that they'll get a good, solid preparation. That is, they will get as good an undergraduate experience as they probably can anywhere, and for some they will be able to take what they're interested in and really find out whether they like English all that much--that's the positive feature of the open curriculum, to expect to do what the open curriculum promises. I think they come with the expectation that they will also participate in some activities here, they will get to know a few faculty fairly well and that they will be able to go to Boston or New York easily. [laughs]

I guess my own hunch is that students come with less well formed expectations than most of the time we would like to assume. I

can remember one particular student who came, a flutist, expecting being able to follow a liberal arts course of study, continue his study of the flute and disregard his having to commute and spend at least one day a week in New York. He had such a series of expectations that we really had to work out a special program. I mean there are those people who come here with the expectation that because we've had a pretty good track record with handicapped students. Some [unclear] girl who couldn't take classes but we worked out something with Southern New England Telephone where she could work at home.

There are special [unclear] issues have distinct expectations, but most are just looking for a good college where they expect they'll learn what they should or do some interesting things academically, but also have an interesting time. I suspect we are known as a pretty friendly community, and some will definitely come here expecting to take advantage of the city location.

PK: What about the college's expectations of the incoming classes?

TL: I think we're as grumpy as ever. I think if you ask any faculty member, he will respond, "We have good expectations. They're all supposed to be Rhoade Scholars and they never are." We always are sort of chronically disappointed, and I think any faculty is, and then in our better moments we recognize there are a group of very interesting students, who when pushed and when we ask things of them will produce. It seems to me that our expectation is distorted by our own commitment to academic life. We can't imagine anyone who isn't, and yet they're going into business and the vast majority are going to do other things. So our own distortions give us a problem, but once we

get beyond them, I think we expect them to be active and take their work serious. We insist that they work hard and I think we expect them to be involved in a while lot of things.

In other words, I don't think our expectations, their performance and the institution's image are that much out of whack, even though I've always maintained that the image of an institution generally either persists long after reality has changed or at least I think in our instances it has lagged. That is, the current image is what we were a while back and it takes time for that image to change out in the public world. I think we're still seen as a more traditional institution than we are. I think we're probably--among those not in the academic world we are not still quite at the rank that our sister institutions would say we are.

PK: What about the role of parents? You mentioned earlier that they've certainly been very helpful in fund-raising, but do you sense that their interest in the college has increased over the years?

TL: I can say that and be misleading, simultaneously. It was quite clear in the '60s and into the early '70s parents stepped back. In many instances they were puzzled by what their own offspring were doing, their interests. There was apparent alienation between younger and older people. It was out there everywhere to be seen, and when students went into drugs or whatever, you were aware that somehow there was that generation gap. It meant more than just a term. It was a real expression of a disengagement between an undergraduate student and his parents. That isn't to say everyone, but a large percentage.

It was curious at that time--we did, for example, we had attempted a long-range planning document at Trinity by involving

parents and everybody in groups on three major topics, and the parents were quite interested in that. They were interested in trying to figure out what to do in the face of what they saw as the changing culture among the young, but they were not as actively involved. They supported us well, but they were coming and asking, "Help us understand our kid," more or less.

That began to change in the '70s and therefore their participation has increased now, partly because there seems to be a fairly discernible reconciliation, if you wish, or the passing of generations of students has brought about a situation in which for a parent to come and watch his daughter in ever lacrosse came she's played in for four years or something doesn't seem like an intrusion. It seems like a very natural thing that even the daughter might like.

There are I think so many more illustrations where parents and their student offspring stay in touch and there is a readiness to have them come on campus, to find out what they're doing and therefore the role of the parents has changed from one of being trying to find out what it's all about to one in which they often step forward as, "Well, according to my daughter, why isn't this..." They've become a different role in a sense now and it's a curious shift in many ways, but I think our parents also are we've found a way, which I'd be hard to describe, to make them feel very comfortable and make them feel at home and take their views seriously. After all, the parents are the ones who made us turn around on the cut we had proposed in the psychological counseling service. It was they who felt that maybe from their point of view that was a very important service and we shouldn't reduce it. I

think that's the sort of thing they're more likely to speak up on and in that process of both hearing and speaking, they I think have a pretty close feeling that it's a minority of them, but still a significant number of parents feel very close to the college, and I think it's astonishing how many past parents continue to contribute to the college. It's just one measure of retaining that much affection or respect for the institute.

PK: Would you characterize briefly what you think the role of the fraternity is going to be in the future of colleges and universities in the United States?

TL: I think New England is in many respects different from the rest of the country, as others would hasten to point out. When fraternities were up here, they were just beginning in the Midwest. When they hit times of trouble, they generally would flourish in the Midwest and the South. Therefore, I don't think it's possible to extrapolate from what's happening, but what I might say about fraternities here at Trinity or even in the east or what's happened around the country, at the present, fraternities are much more popular than they were a decade ago.

Here certainly a decade ago when we had 12 within a very short time after I arrived it was down to 6 and immediately if some alumni were wondering if I was just subtly deteriorating their plans or discouraging them. They were very suspicious of my being interested in getting fraternities. Now, I suspect that was because not that far back Williams had and they wondered if this was a trend. Of course, it was more of the product of what was happening with the students than anything we were doing. We reserved benevolent neutrality.

Fraternities began obviously to swing back as times became calmer and as the social life of students seemed to play about a more prominent role. We might want to talk a little bit about that in a moment, but the fraternities began to revive and yet the problem with the fraternity which we're wrestling with right now is that the kind of stewardship that I maybe very fuzzily remember being exercised by senior members of the fraternity, I don't see present in most fraternities. Occasionally a good, strong president will come along, but they are acting like enclaves and it is very difficult for them and for us to help them play a more positive role. They can recognize at times that it's in their self-interest to provide more than parties, but they are social clubs and I think that's become their almost sole reason for existence is a social club where in earlier times they often became identified, here for example, with the putting out of the ivy or the even with the running of the Tripod, as was true when I first arrived. That was St. A's prerogative, virtually, and they were the ones who always supplied the debaters to the now defunct athenaeum, although John Daniel tells me debating is coming back next year.

I guess my fear is that having narrowed their function to the social base, with rising costs and taxes, poor physical plants in most cases and dues that go higher and higher, that it may be difficult for them to make it through. Of course, right now what we're struggling with is a kind of indifferent social behavior. They are not serving as examples, but rather they're serving almost to the contrary. This is how we let down a college, kind of thing that's happening and I think that won't wear well over time. There are just too many clashes around, as

you know, when and I wrote a year or so ago to the fraternities about their situation I alluded to what has happened at Dartmouth. It has happened in too many other places, no one is very happy about the fraternities these days and I think their future is bleak, to speak candidly.

We may get through and they may sustain themselves and come back stronger, but I think it will require leadership and a better notion of what else they can do to become social refuges for great big affairs and so forth.

PK: I want to ask you about student self-government on campus. I'm interested in whether or not you think there is great apathy, as there has been in the past. I clearly call to mind here the operation of the Student Senate, which when I was a student in the early '60s I thought was a fairly well developed form of government versus the present situation, the Student Government Association. Is there any way to characterize this whole question? Has there been a decline in interest at least, in student government?

TL: I think there has been a change and I'll save a direct answer until the end of whatever I have to say here. First, it seems to me that when the Medusa decided to go out of business in '68, spring of '68, that was probably not all that bad. It was left over from an early era and it represented a kind of seemed laudable effort to self-discipline by students to themselves, but it was such a crony operation and it was also so oblivious to due process that I think sooner or later it should have gone. That it went, I don't think you can draw from that was somehow a collapse of student interest. I think students had moved in

their understanding of what might be involved in discipline to quite new positions.

The Senate was another matter. It was trying to play a significant role in '68 and '69. Certainly we met with them rather regularly in the committee room with luncheons and what two things happened, it seemed to me, to kill the Senate or for it to commit its own suicide. Number one is it had been captured by the student activists largely. Not all members were student activists, but the motor force was that of a few students who were interested in a fairly sophisticated form of political action which they couldn't handle that well. Secondly, they could not understand that if you are going to have strong student government, you've got a three-legged stool. You've got student government, you've got faculty role and you've got administration and what they I think discovered was that if you've got to work with three constituencies, you can't just have lunch with the president and vice president and get your way, that there's another group you're going to have to sell on it out there. That took a lot of politicking that I think that called for so much time, energy and sophistication that very few had it and very few wanted it and when the leadership decided that it was getting to be a "Dickey Mouse" game, as they called it, and they pulled out of it, then there wasn't anything left to sustain it, as it had been set up mainly as a small body presumably working on behalf of the whole student body. Then began the process of trying to reconstruct student government on some broader base.

Basically, at Trinity there's another reason I think student government went through some of these difficulties and still has trouble

being a strong organization or mobilizing strong student opinion and so forth, is that the budget process, the distribution of the student fee has always been pretty separated from what student government is doing. When I first came here and was talking to the Senate, I said, "You have a Mather Board of Governors that's dispersing money and you haven't got a nickel to your name. How are you going to play politics?" You got to have the purse strings there or it won't work. Well, so much for presidential advice. I could have told them how to run the student government. I mean I had been involved when I was here and I knew perfectly well you can't do it without getting those two together and that's I think difficult.

I think in the last few years we've seen, despite all their wanting to change the constitution and now the ludicrous notion that they should elect officers twice a year, pretty soon all they'll be doing is coping with the mechanics of it. Overlooking that slight deviation, basically, I think there is a return in interest in the student government, but it's not unlike national politics in that every interest group represented by the various clubs, once they got their budget request and get some money, they go their own way and they don't have to work with student government to carry out their purposes. Student government ends up with not a great deal to do, if the individual groups are satisfied and able to carry out their own objectives.

Once again, it would take some major issues to bring it together. When you and I think back, when was the last All College Meeting of any significance? It goes back almost ten years since we've had one. There have been attempts, but nothing like the older ones. It may well

be that because of the Board of Fellows, which has had its problems as part of our governing operation. The Board of Fellows sort of floundered around, too, in a sympathetic role. They now may have latched onto something by working fairly closely with student organizations and student government as a way to get student opinion and judgment on what are serious issues and what we should be doing about it. The Board of Fellows' meeting with the students four times a year, those who want to come, with the help and sort of under the auspices of the student government, they may combined begin to rally some student opinion about issues and begin to crystallize it and bring it into a form where student government can do something like Awareness Day and to present in some fairly substantial way well thought out projects, plans, programs, protests or whatever.

I think the difficulty has been that they get an idea and unless Tom Smith and Dave Weiner get in to help them reformulate it and reframe it, it never gets anywhere because nobody is that well acquainted with process, nor seems to have that degree of interest.

PK: What led to the formation to the Trinity College Council and what has become of its function?

TL: Oh, that's a nice historical question.

PK: Isn't' that a good one?

TL: That's a good one. I hadn't thought about that organization in a long while. Well, I shall never forget in my opening convocation talking about governance and feeling that the Trinity College Council, which was to represent all the constituencies and would have been a replacement, in effect, for the collapse of student government and for

this kind of tripartite system that we had operated under normally, the Trinity College Council was my proposal for a community governing body which would review major issues, make recommendations to the president, would not have power that really couldn't be granted to them without trustee concurrence, but also probably would not have been a workable system. Anyway, they would make recommendations and I had to make public either my support or denial of the occurrence publicly within a relatively short time.

It was an attempt to get at what I saw was a disenchantment, almost a disbelief in the ways colleges were being governed and to restore some confidence, bring some community feeling and collegial atmosphere into the decision making process on local issues. It worked for a while. It helped us get through a lot of sticky wickets and as the central issues began to dissipate in the early '70s, it went into infrequent issues, into mothballs and into memory. [laughs]

It still exists out there on paper, but it hasn't been brought together for a long time and I think interestingly enough, if you tried to, the faculty would think it was some sort of exercise like jogging with no particular purpose in mind, and the student government would get all excited, probably feeling there was some attempt to undermine student government.

PK: What about student service on committees?

TL: Very mixed results from student services on committee. I know I can recall the Financial Affairs Committee when for years we didn't have student members come all regularly, if at all. Yet, here was a central committee on which they could have learned a lot and an enterprising

student should have run. Now, more recently we've had better luck. I think on a committee such as Institutional Priorities Council when we set that to look over what should be our priorities for the next five years, there was a very --

[end of side 1, tape 5]

PK: --continuation of interview with President Lockwood, May 18, 1981. Talking about student service on committees.

TL: As I was saying, the Institutional Priorities Council was an opportunity for some students to make some strong points that would have influenced the college policy. They chose not to. The Curriculum Committee I understand has been up and down and I guess has been better of late. It has been interesting to me that the reports I receive about the two students serving on the Presidential Search Committee, they've been praised. They have played a very full and very faithful role on that committee, and I think it's where they might realistically sense it pays off and they're probably a lot smarter than we would admit in recognizing, "Oh, they're just placating us or creating the illusion they're paying attention." I think they sense out frequently whether it's, what do they call it, tokenism, whether it's worth the time and effort. Committees can be very ponderous bodies.

But I guess I would say that there is just not enough political sensitivity on campus. That is, there is not enough who want to do it either for the experience or out of conviction to make the effort to really play a role. That's a very small number of students, when you come down to it. Therefore, I'm not surprised. I think it's worth the

effort and we will probably continue to rock it along because there's no particular point in asking them off the committees.

I can recall earlier when this first came up with the faculty, great fear that all sorts of information would get out that shouldn't and so forth and so on, and I think our fears that we'd have to tape everything we ever said because otherwise we'd have a lawsuit from some student, that now is almost hard to believe that we reacted that way, as a result of the experience we've had. Nobody's uptight about that.

The one area where students want to knock on the door still, of course, is in appointments and promotions and that surfaces from time to time. Clearly, the faculty aren't prepared and I think it would be a mistake, but it's also very hard to persuade students that they play a role, both by the courses they chose to enroll in and by the letters they write. All the apparatus that's now available is about as effective as any we can concoct, but symbolically it doesn't seem that significant.

PK: Let me ask you about the Career Counseling Office's function. Certainly, it's changed greatly in the last ten years. Do you think it's playing an effective role?

TL: All the questions you ask I can answer yes, because if I answer no then I've failed. So that takes care of that one--yes. [laughs] We had a Placement Office. That was a kind of interesting term we used when John Butler had a style, which once again he was tremendous. He was beloved and it represented an earlier way of going about business, as it were. It worked very well when everybody was going out into jobs or 50% were going onto graduate and professional studies. It was a quite different ballgame. Suddenly when you moved beyond that and a less

promising picture emerged in the job market, competition for medical school, everything became much more harsh from a student point of view. It seemed as though we should shift our emphasis to an operation which helped students understand how you go about making career choices in the first place and then how you implement choices, how you go about the next step of interviewing or applying and so on and so forth. So ours became a counseling service rather than, "Come in. Fill out the form and we'll call you next week when we've got that special window washing job."

That change I think has been important. It hasn't satisfied everyone, but I think it's operating quite well now. I think we have a good operation which the fact that people can take tests and they have a library and leads, some of the traditional apparatus that they use and so forth. I think they understand it much better, if they wish to take time and the fact that we go into the freshman seminar now and say, "Look, as you go along you're supposed to be not thinking about jobs, but in case you do we have this operation."

My only worry about any of these things is that we have taken onto ourselves, as it were, as institutions, responsibilities which cost money, but which also I'm not sure should necessarily be ours. I've always been teased by the notion that if we stripped ourselves of a lot of our obligations that we've developed, counseling being one--counseling of all different kinds--and got down sort of to the basics, or as someone said, "Moved forward to the basics," we might be a crisper more focused institution. I think people say, "Well, it's not clear what all you do here." I think part of it is we do so many different things,

we provide so much more and that's a consequence, however, when you have to highly residential a population as we now do. You are in the hotel business, whether you want it or not. You're in the food business. You're in all these businesses.

That worries me over time because you increase your management needs and you involve yourselves in commitments that are very hard to dismantle, for which somebody has to pay a price and for which we may not be the best practitioners. I think in terms of if you really want to get career counseling and so forth, there is some probably real pros out there, but obviously the cost is high and it's less convenient so you end up with what I think is a good operation, but can never match the big professional firms.

So you've got yourself another illustration, it seems to me, of what has happened since you, especially I, went to college. you have so many more of these now quite professional operations going on. When you think of the infirmary, we used to have just a couple of beds and Tuckee Swan over at Seabury. When you got sick that was all you had available and now you have quite a professional 24-hour service and so on, which is a product of state law. Society wants that kind of health care available, but we've got a commitment there that runs up $200,000 a year, just in maintaining a medical service.

PK: Let's move onto the curriculum and ask you if you would briefly characterize the nature of the open curriculum in which we are now functioning, the role you played in developing that and whether or not you think the various options that are open, non classroom courses, have been effective.

TL: I'm going to restrict myself to my reactions to it and not repeat what's available in print about the open curriculum. It was ironic to me that having played a role '64-65 in the creation at Union College of something called Comprehensive Education, a reformulation or new style of what was a traditional general education program, that after having seen that get started and having taught in it, that as I became acquainted with the discussion that began here in '67 with the special committee and they were in touch with me during '67, late' 67-68 about the progress of their conversation, I found myself having greater and greater difficulty with the requirement approach. The distribution requirement in particular had always troubled me and therefore I was interested in and generally supportive of the decision the committee was approaching, namely to do away with distribution requirements.

I was somewhat worried about the absence of some freshmen experience and therefore pleased, and as we began to work on it I got more active in the design of the freshmen seminar. That seemed to make good sense.

Probably I think it should be made clear that I didn't have that much to do with the total design of the open curriculum as some people, maybe those who didn't like it, think I had. In large part the committee had worked that out. There were sort of three or four, as I saw it, missing elements in which I played a critical role.

Number one, it seemed to me that having arrived at an open curriculum, we didn't have a very good way of expressing what else we expected students to do. No guidelines at all as to what constituted an educated person, to use the ed book terminology, and quite literally I

wrote down those guidelines one afternoon, came into the committee and said, "Set up some guideline courses or groups of courses. Here are areas which people ought to know about." So that that was sort of thrust in, largely on my initiative fairly late in the game.

A second area was to develop some options which would encourage people in independent study. We were vaguely kicking around--at least I was in my own mind--the whole internship notion and some way in which people could tailor their own programs on a highly individual, self driven mode, and hence the introduction of some of the options which were on independent study. I felt that I helped them clarify what kinds of things might be possible out of that.

The third thing was the whole notion of how you get it through the faculty. It seemed to me with, I don't know whether it was 28 or 29 points that they were making, descriptive options and so forth, including what some of had a little enthusiasm for, student taught courses and all that sort of thing, was how you got it through a faculty without it coming apart and with some key element getting knocked out and so forth. So I was basically instrumental in setting up what I called the Omnibus Bill. That is you go through the discussion point by point, but you buy the package, unless you amend it. You don't pick out just what you want and let the rest go. It seemed to me that was a critical thing that they had to come up against because they weren't sure how many faculty would go along with the whole deal, and if you started making compromises, whether they'd end up with something they didn't want as a committee. So I helped guide that through the faculty discussion.

Then finding the rationale for it, in a sense afterwards, finding what we could say beyond what the committee itself said quite well in its introduction. How to lift that to the higher theoretical level. That was always my task and still is, how you explain most effectively to your public which sometimes is skeptical of the open curriculum, its educational motives, motif.

So that I think is one of the things that I've had to do all along. I've tried out mission statement after mission statement and sent them out and if anything ends up as a dud out there, are those mission statements. Nobody seems to really care. [laughs] Doesn't make that much difference, except that's my responsibility.

Out of that I think the two things that I would just touch on briefly that I was particularly--two or three things I was particularly interested seeing come out of that. One was the growth and control of independent study and we had to go through a second study of that to bring that under control because when it sort of burst on the scene and we really developed it, we had some aberrations as well as successes. Getting independent study as a way through which a student can gain real self-confidence and doing something, be it overseas or here, I thought was very important.

Certainly a second was the development of the internships and the use of the city here. We had a little experience opening up, seeing the possibilities of linkages. I kept saying, "We have an opportunity, if not an obligation, to let students test their ideas in practice. See if there's any connection between what they're learning and what they

could conceivably do." So I felt that the growth of internships was an important one.

Finally, of course, the individualized degree program, which I was highly interested in, which I would say and you can find somewhere if you have it in the archives--I can find it for you--Jack Wagget when he was at the University of Michigan sent to a couple of people here and I guess he came himself to do an analysis of just how in heaven's name the individualized degree program came into being. I think his conclusion was, as I recall, that was eventually it was nobody wanted to oppose it that much and if everybody could kind of agree, it was, "Oh, we'll let the president have his individualized degree program and we won't have to worry about it. It won't get off the ground."

There was kind of a cynicism over its founding. There were some who were enthusiastic and certainly some faculty critically jumped in to formulate the study. I thought that was a very important option which I had hoped would intrigue talented students to come to Trinity and take advantage of it. It didn't work that way, but it served to bring in adults at a time when we were beginning to talk about, "Where was the next clientele?" That was going to be the goal of mine for everyone. We were all going to serve in training people who were coming back to college and provide all these wonderful adult courses, at of course a high premium or something like that. It's been one of the grand illusions of higher education.

Yes, of course, large numbers of older people are now going to colleges, but not going to colleges like Trinity. We wouldn't know

what to do with them if they came, quite frankly. Our faculty isn't very well adapted for this, but to do the kind of thing we've now been doing in the individualized degree program, which has been certainly a slow grower. It's had to be nurtured carefully, but I think now is one of the things I look back and say, "That was a pretty good idea and ten years from now we'll be awfully glad we have it," because it's proved a very easy way for older students to come into the scene. I think every faculty member who has had them in one way or another has found them very interesting students, indeed. I think this can be important contribution to a small number of older students, but exactly what we can do most effectively is our traditional business, but done in a different format and a different style.

Those are some of the curriculum things that I have played some role in and are interesting.

PK: In the closing minutes of interview, perhaps you would be willing to touch on two areas that interest me. One you mentioned in passing and I find a fascinating development. That's the change in the nature of the composition of the Board of Trustees in an effort to broaden the constituent members of it with regard to areas of the society. Secondly, the role of the alumni of the college, not just in fund-raising but in general support for the college.

TL: The Board of Trustees had to change because we had virtually way beyond the annual election of one alumni trustee, we had no way to change the constituency, either out of consideration to the trustees themselves or out of need for the institution. The board was 62 and a half years old on average when arrived. It had served a generation

very well. Times had changed in '68 and we had to have younger people. We needed more movability, flexibility. So thanks largely to Lyman Brainard, to whom I submitted all these ideas, I basically restructured it and came up with a system to have term trustees, have retirement at 72 because we had no retirement age, and we'd begin to get this turnover.

That's not an easy matter with a board that is looking itself with a reasonable pride and to suddenly by implication be told, "You're too old. We've got get different people on here." Any way you can slice it, it comes out not sounding exactly like the sales pitch you'd like to make. But we pulled it off. We got that board changed and I say "we" because it involved a few trustees and not just my efforts.

In many ways that was just in time, in my book. We were able to move out and get women, which we needed. We were able to get some people in, two rather younger alumni, more people from outside the college. We had to reach out in a number of different directions, including most recently obviously to get a black on the board, while being quite careful that these were people that could serve us well and not just represent in a way that doesn't work, particular constituencies.

That transition you can't achieve in a short time. I has taken time. The board had to deal with issues and had to talk about it. We had to redo the whole approach to the agenda. We had to get all the routine matters knocked off that agenda so we didn't talk about those things that had already been decided endlessly, and get on with major issues, whether it was anywhere from student affairs, educational policy, building needs to community involvement and so forth.

Once again, we did use a few ad hoc committees along the way and had developed I think a good openness on the board where discussions are important and sometimes wandered more broadly than I would have preferred.

The fact that I stepped out of the chairmanship, that I refused to be that chairman of the board, meant we also have brought in some board member, Lyman then Barkley Shawman, George Starkey, to be chairman, which I think was important.

We haven't completed the job. We still have a way to go, I think, although we're now beginning to get additional alumnus trustees. We've got a term trustee almost every year and because of retirement and things, we get generally a charter trustee. So we're getting 2, 3, 4 openings each year which we can therefore be getting new fresh views, different views in terms of professions and alumni and non-alumni. We've got solid representation in the city, essentially which we couldn't achieve if we just depended on alumni trustees.

So I think this has been a very important thing, but I will say this, Peter, I think it takes more orchestration that one realizes. It takes more patience and molding or whatever you want to call it. Some people say control, but that's too harsh. Certainly it took more time than I had expected. It should receive more time than I can give it and when I was away last fall that board almost came apart over a number of issues and it just taught all of us that it takes a lot of effort. That's because you can't duck it, whether it's a corporate board or not. You've got a public responsibility that's more visible, more public and you can't not exercise, even though if things go well this board is very congenial

and happy. They've been a very gracious and well-disciplined board, but if it's neglected it will get into bad habits. It just will because they can't function without a fair amount of cultivation and attention.

PK: And the alumni, in our last minute or two.

TL: I think the alumni are changing. As I think I said earlier, it's a lot different when you have now almost 20 years or better of primarily residential students who have become alumni. I remember we had a period when half of the students were commuters and that experience of the last 20 years I think is creating a new kind of alumni body.

We've had good fortune. It's a small group of extraordinarily faithful, dedicated and interested alumni who probably have been less critical of their institution than many in the alumni body. It's a kind of funny thing and I don't want to get into it, but we don't have the phenomenon, the Shelby Colbin Davis Phenomenon of Concerned Alumni of Princeton or the Amherst Alumni Climbing all over like Bill Ward and so forth. They have been a very cooperative and generally not too critical alumni body and support not accustomed to financial support on large scale, but that will come in due time.

Now you've got a body that I think is much more interested in what's happening in the college, rather than just feeling good about the college in a vague way. These newer alumni want to find out. You go to an alumni meeting and you're no longer meeting with an older group of alumni who just remember it with affection and just want to kind of have a nostalgic evening. I find when I go there, I'm likely to be the oldest one that's there and I have to talk with a group of people that want to know what happened to the urban environmental studies.

There's a quite different atmosphere and I think that's something that we will see the results multiply as time goes on.

We're building, in a sense, a whole new alumni body out there and the older, the great alumni of the college who carried us through a tough period in the '30s and then again in a sense as we kind of reconstructed ourselves in the late '40s and early '50s, that was an important group but they've largely gone from the scene and now we're beginning to see this new wave that are going to be important in a quite different kind of alumni body.

PK: Thank you, Mr. President, for a very pleasant experience interview.

TL: It's enjoyable to try to put these things in some perspective. Thank you for asking me to do it. I've enjoyed it.

End of Interview